

COMMENTS AND RESPONSE

General Information

Facility Name: Decatur County Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (Waste Services of Decatur, LLC, Contractor and Operator for Decatur County).
Emission Source Reference No. 20-0052
Permit No. 558760
Date Application Received: December 22, 2005
Date Application Deemed Complete: December 22, 2005
Date of First Public Notice for Title V Permit: January 20, 2010 (30-day comment period January 20 - Feb 19, 2010)
Date of Second Public Notice for Public Hearing: March 10, 2010 (comment period March 10 - April 20, 2010)
Date of Public Hearing: April 20, 2010
Extended Comment Period: April 20, 2010 through April 23, 2010

Summary of written comments and TN APC response to commenters “Before the Public Hearing” Letters and E-mail

Color codes for each category of air pollution related comments:

1. **Public Hearing Request** – blue highlight with white font
2. **Title V concerns regarding application, processing, permit issuance** – red font
3. **Odors** – brown font
4. **Need for a landfill gas collection and control system (GCCS) & comments** – yellow highlight
5. **Air quality and quality of life/welfare** – purple font
6. **Health effects** – green font
7. **Landfill flares** – blue font
8. **Hazardous and air toxic emissions** – light gray highlight
9. **Fog** – orange font

For comments from citizens and other parties not associated related to the above Title V air issues comments are in ***bold italics***.

Commenter	Comments quoted or paraphrased (Item numbers listed)	TN APC Response
<p>1. Franklin (Frank) Barber 8972 Mt. Carmel Road, Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Current Address: 2475 Conley Rd. Morris, IL 60450</p> <p>Contact information provided: 815-942-6324 fbarber597@ yahoo.com</p> <p>Letter Dated: 2/15/2010 received: 2/17/2010</p>	<p>Letters (Letters 1 - 8) for the first public comment period of Jan 20, 2010 through February 19, 2010 comprise Attachment 1.</p> <p>1a The Decatur County Municipal Solid Waste Landfill, a Hazardous Special Waste Landfill must be having trouble meeting the air emissions regulations for the State of Tennessee, but since you haven't checked the landfill since the 1980's or 1990's how would you know?"</p>	<p>1a The TN Division of Air Pollution Control (TN APC) must process a Title V permit (EPA major source operating permit) for a municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill that has both a design capacity volume of 2.5 million cubic meters and a mass design capacity for 2.5 million megagrams (Mg or 10⁶ grams) of waste (equivalent to 2.756 million tons of waste). EPA regulatory rules follow. The above dual threshold for applicability, that is, mass combined with the landfill storage volume make a MSW subject to specific stipulations in the federal New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW- Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills promulgated on March 12, 1996. This federal (EPA) air regulation (NSPS) pertains to affected landfills that commenced construction, reconstruction, or were modified after May 30, 1991. Once both these EPA/NSPS threshold values have been exceeded, then a Title V permit application must be submitted and a Title V operating permit is required (60.752) (b) laying out the air requirements a MSW must meet.</p>

A chronology of events follows that relate to the Title V air permitting of Decatur County Landfill contracted to be operated by Waste Services of Decatur, LLC.

During 1998 TN APC began identifying and processing the first set of Title V permits for all sorts of facilities provided a company was subject to Title V. In November 1998 EPA defined emission guidelines and clarified applicability addressing construction, modifications, and expansions for a MSW as it pertained to NSPS.

On December 22, 2005 TN APC received a Title V application for Decatur County Landfill. This was submitted based on entire full build-out capacity rather than on the commencement of construction of cell expansion that was permitted and allowed by the TN Division of Solid Waste Management Pollution Control (DWSM). Approval from DWSM had been given for construction and operation of Cells 3B and Cell 3C. On October 9, 2001, Cells 3B and 3C were approved by letter under the permitting authority of DWSM. However, the dual threshold for Title V had not yet been reached by the additional construction of these cells.

Once construction of an additional Cell 3D began in August 2008, this put into place an expansion modification such that when completed the dual threshold for Title V under NSPS requirements was finally reached for the entire landfill. Existing cells plus the newly constructed one (Cell 3D) then attained a waste mass design capacity of 2.503 million Mg. A July 14, 2009 DWSM letter confirmed by a DWSM inspection, authorized and permitted the landfill to operate Cell 3D. Under 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW, a **modification** is defined as an increase in the permitted volume design capacity of the landfill when **construction commences** for a vertical or horizontal expansion of the landfill. Thus, the process of submitting a Title V permit application would have been invoked with this expansion requiring a Title V application to be submitted no later than 90 days of the start of said construction.

Accordingly, this landfill, due to the dates above, was not a relevant matter for Title V consideration in 1980's or the 1990's. In the 1990 Clean Air Act, the Title V program began and was applicable to MSW landfills if they qualified only after March 12, 1996. This explains that air regulations for this MSW landfill and other landfills have not been ignored nor could they legally be required, requested, and processed in the 1980's or 1990's. TN APC was obligated or required to process an air permit (Title V) for Decatur County Landfill only if and when the dual threshold of mass and volume criteria was met.

	<p>1b Methane gas flares do not even exist there.</p> <p>1c They have no methane gas extraction system.</p> <p>1d It should be a criminal offense to let them dump methane gas with all the other hazardous chemicals and metals into the air.</p> <p>1e Why do you people in Nashville just sit back and say that since the landfill hasn't had any violations, we will issue this permit to allow them to dump even more hazardous materials into the air rather than force them to install a flare system which would get rid of most of the hazardous material, but not all of it, then they will not need this permit.</p> <p>1f Even the people in Nashville would not permit a hazardous special waste landfill under these conditions. Is the landfill legally permitted? If not, how is it possible you can give them a permit to increase their air emissions?</p> <p>1g I am asking for a public hearing.</p> <p>1h Mr. Barber also had written comments and concerns regarding no leachate recovery, insufficient ground water monitoring, aquifer contamination, and hazardous waste being received.</p>	<p>1b The landfill put into place 3 odor flares in 2006 although they were not required to do so. This is not the same as a central flare and collection system (GCCS).</p> <p>1c Per 60.752(b) once the non-methane organic compound emissions (NMOC) emissions reach 50 megagrams (Mg)/yr or 55.11 tons/yr, the owner operator shall install a gas collection and control system (GCCS). Landfills once subject to the rule typically use a landfill gas collection system routed to a large central flare. The Dec. 2008 NMOC test data (Tier 2 test) indicated 13.8 Mg/yr of NMOC was emitted which is far less (28% of the standard) than the 50 Mg/yr NMOC threshold requiring a gas collection system. Based on this testing data, it is likely that several years must pass before the NMOC emission threshold is reached requiring a landfill gas collection and central flare system for methane.</p> <p>1d Although other gaseous emissions exist, non-hazardous methane is the most common emission.</p> <p>1e See response to 1c and refer to the EPA emission threshold of 50 Mg/yr of NMOC that must be reached before EPA rules require any landfill to install a gas collection and control such as a central flare system. This cannot be imposed on the landfill until this emission rate is substantiated and is dependent on the mass of waste the landfill receives.</p> <p>1f The air permit is undergoing the Title V permitting procedure consistent with what other Title V sources and similar landfills must undergo. Once a landfill reaches the EPA Title V threshold for mass and size, a Title V permit application must be submitted in a prescribed timely manner and this has been done. Regarding being legally permitted, TDEC permits already issued include the DSWM Class 1 solid waste landfill permit (SNL 20-101-0254) and the previous Division of Water Pollution (this Division is now known as the Division of Water Resources) Permit No. SOP-95026 for a leachate collection system (pump and haul).</p> <p>1g A public hearing was granted not only at the request of Mr. Barber but for all the other individuals that requested one in writing during the public comment period. This allowed them to voice their concerns as well as submit additional written comments.</p> <p>1h Although comments on water pollution, groundwater, contamination in an aquifer, and hazardous waste are very important environmental concerns, the issues in this permit deal with air pollution. Ground water monitoring wells are in place around the landfill. A leachate collection and treatment system was permitted by the Division of</p>
--	---	---

<p>2. Jan and David Trabue 78 Rivers Edge Cove Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter Dated: 2/10/2010 received: 2/17/2010</p>	<p>2a Decatur County is known to be the Great Outdoors of Tennessee. 2a If this permit is allowed, I guess we will all have to stay indoors. 2b <i>It is sad that a few local businessmen</i> for a few bucks 2c are trying to destroy what little beauty we have here in Decatur County.</p> <p>2d We oppose the Class I Title V permit being applied for by Waste Industries, Inc. 2e and request a public hearing.</p>	<p><i>Water Pollution Control (now Water Resources). The DSWM permit(s) contains restrictions on the type of waste can that can be received by this Class 1 landfill and requires approval before any special waste can be received. Per this permit no hazardous waste pursuant to TCA 68-212-101 can be accepted.</i></p> <p>2a & c Staying indoors and the beauty and aesthetics comment will be considered an air quality and quality of life concern. The landfill must meet current air and solid waste requirements.</p> <p>2b <i>The landfill is owned by Decatur County. TN APC cannot attest to the number of local owners/partners that are financial partners invested in the Decatur County Landfill that receives local municipal and regional waste. The contracted operator of the landfill is Waste Services of Decatur, LLC (WSD) and is a subsidiary of the parent company Waste Industries (WI) owning landfill waste management firms in the south.</i></p> <p>2d Opposition to the permit is duly noted. Regarding opposition to the Title V air permit that is classified by the DWSM as a Class 1 landfill, EPA regulations require the state of TN, TDEC, and specifically TN APC to process a Title V permit when both the design size volume and amount (mass) of waste a landfill reach the dual threshold levels as mentioned in the 1a response. This threshold having been met, TN APC is proceeding with the processing of the permit. 2e A public hearing was granted.</p>
<p>3. Larry and Alice Bicknell 95 Shannon West P O Box 272 Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter Dated: 2/11/2010 received: 2/17/2010</p>	<p>3a We oppose the Class I Title V permit being applied for by Waste Industries, Inc., 3b and request that a public hearing on the application be held. This will give us a chance to learn more about the application and also to voice our concerns.</p>	<p>3a See 2d response. 3b A public hearing was granted. The Title V application as stated in the public notice was also made available at the local public library (depository) for perusal. Details about the application and proposed Title V permit were provided at the public hearing and all who wished to speak were allowed to do so.</p>
<p>4. Dawn Sweeney 1205 Kaw-Liga Dr. Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter Dated: 2/12/2010 received: 2/17/2010</p>	<p>4a I object very strongly and oppose a Class I permit being applied for by Waste Industries, Inc. 4b and request a public hearing. 4c We that live here in this community do not think that we should have increased traffic; 4d live with toxins, 4e nor do we think that we should have to put up with objectionable odors.</p>	<p>4a See 2d response. 4b A public hearing was granted.</p> <p>4c The traffic is not part of the air permit. The trucks carrying the waste in and returning for waste will always be a presence at the landfill.</p> <p>4d The primary emissions from landfill gas are from methane from the decaying waste. Non methane organic compounds (NMOC) constitute a small amount of the landfill gas (less than 1%) with some hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). Other gases are also released. 4e All landfills will have odors from daily working and burial of garbage and trash. Waste is compacted and has adequate ground cover to bury it adequately and reduce odors. Also, decaying organic matter release odors. Odors are affected by o humidity, wind direction, and other factors. Although not required to do so, the landfill has installed 3 odor</p>

<p>5. Clifford Towell 1195 Kaw-Liga Dr. Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter received: 2/17/2010</p> <p>6. Judith A. Towell 1195 Kaw-Liga Dr. Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter Dated: 2/12/2010 received: 2/17/2010</p> <p>7. Linda Barr 915 Bob's Lake Lane Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter received: 2/18/2010</p> <p>8. John Topper 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter received: 2/23/2010</p> <p>9. Pam McGaha 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>Letter received: 2/23/2010</p>	<p>5. I moved into the Bath Springs area because of 5a the beautiful country side, friendly people and the wonderful FRESH AIR...5b I DO NOT think that Waste Services Inc. should be allowed to double unabated pollution emissions and ruin Decatur County's fresh air. 5c. I am requesting that you have a public hearing.</p> <p>6a I object very strongly and oppose to Class I permit being applied for by Waste Industries, Inc. and 6b request a public hearing. We that live here in this community do not think that we should have increased traffic; live with toxins, nor do we think that we should have to put up with objectionable odors.</p> <p>7. I have a home at 915 Bob's Lake Lane in Bath Springs, TN. 7a I oppose the Class I Title V permit being applied for by Waste Industries, Inc. 7b At the very least there should be a public hearing concerning this issue.</p> <p>8a The letter is to serve an expression of opposition to the Title V permit sought by Waste Services for the operation of the Decatur County Landfill and to 8b request a public hearing.</p> <p>9. A letter to the editor of The News Leader was written. This contained a commentary and plea to prompt local citizens to write in and 9a request a public hearing using a clip-out form to be mailed. This was written and paid for by Ms. Pam McGaha. This editorial and appeal was directed to the citizens of Decatur County and was printed in The News Leader on February 17, 2010. This editorial letter and form for a request for a public hearing was also mailed to TN APC Director Barry Stephens. See Attachment 2.</p> <p>Ms. McGaha expressed her concerns about a Title V Permit (major source operating permit), lack of a gas collection and control system, stating emissions would double, numerous toxic pollutants would be emitted, and that local county officials appeared indifferent to this matter. She urged citizens to "clip out the form", mail it in, and send</p>	<p>flares to help reduce landfill odors and has taken other measures to reduce the odors. See response to 21g. TN has no odor laws.</p> <p>5a Degradation of fresh air will be considered a comment about a concern for air quality affecting the quality of life.</p> <p>5b Emissions have not doubled and are based on the actual amount of waste processed and landfill gas concentrations measured by testing using EPA prescribed procedure in 2008. The amount of waste received was over- predicted.</p> <p>5c The public hearing was granted.</p> <p>6. The comments and response are exactly the same wording as that of Ms. Dawn Sweeney. See the response to Ms. Sweeney in Item 4.</p> <p>7a Opposition to the Title V permit has been noted.</p> <p>7b The public hearing was granted.</p> <p>8a Opposition to the Title V permit has been noted.</p> <p>8b The public hearing was granted.</p> <p>9. Please see TDEC email response from the media and contact person for TDEC Meg Lockhart. The TDEC response was compiled using input from TDEC technical staff to respond to Ms. McGaha's concerns. The public hearing was granted.</p> <p>These concerns for a GCCS were addressed in response to Item 1. Emissions alleged to have doubled are addressed in Item 5b response.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Petitioners with a mail-in form all postmarked on or before 2/19/2010</p> <p>Bradley (Brad) Jones 1320 Smoky Road Savannah, TN 38372</p> <p>Randy Smith 1175 AB Montgomery Loop Bath Springs, TN 38311</p> <p>James & Katherine Tomlinson 2540 Hohammer Road Holladay, TN 38341</p> <p>John & Kristen Alexander 75 Tuten Dr. Parsons, TN 38363</p> <p>Alan & Tammy Wood 949 Kiloford Rd Parsons, TN 38363</p> <p>Chris & Dana Curtis 2935 Hwy 100 W Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Joe L. & Patty Burkhead 2487 Hwy 412 W Parsons, TN 38363</p> <p>Myra Ivory 325 E White Oak St Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Peggy Scott 4951 Brooksie Thompson Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Mazle Montgomery 1122 AB Montgomery Loop Bath Springs, TN 38311</p>	<p>comments and notes to TN APC Director Barry Stephens requesting a public hearing</p> <p>The following 93 individuals' names were on a "clip-out form/petition" form that appeared in the local newspaper directed to TN APC Director Barry Stephens. The forms were filled out by 26 couples at the same address (52 people) plus 41 individuals at various local addresses. All were mailed to TN APC.</p> <p>Each form was identical, was signed or had a printed name(s) and address and read as follows:</p> <p>" request a public hearing for the citizens of Decatur County with regards to the Title V permit request that has been applied for by Waste Industries, Inc."</p>	<p>The public hearing was announced by a public notice that appeared in a local paper Decatur County paper, The News Leader stating the public hearing would be held at Riverside High School, Decaturville, TN at 7 PM on April 20, 2010.</p>
---	---	---

Kyle & Kristen Smith
6314 Three Way Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Shelley Hamm
982 AB Montgomery Loop
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Michael Hamm
982 Bob's Landing Rd
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Tonya & Ricky Manley
1892 Five Forks
Parsons, TN 38363

Leanna Raney
265 E White Oak Street
Decaturville, TN 38329

Rosalind & Cord Laster
51 Pentecost St
Parsons, TN 38363

Kyla & Linda Whitsitt
2164 Box Road
Darden, TN 38328

Brent & Jana Montgomery
580 Wayne Townsend
Lane
Parsons, TN 38363

Janice Smart
1175 AB Montgomery
Loop
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Brian & Laura Jones
1320 Smoky Road
Savannah, TN 38372

Woody Jones
1320 Smoky Road
Savannah, TN 38372

Raymond Smart
1050 Sims Bottom Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Henrietta C. McCorcler
52 Magnolia Dr.
Parsons, TN 38363

Jim Pitts
667 Cedar Bluff Dr.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Woodrow R Mayo
13435 Mt. Carmel Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Sarah P. Spalding
230 Timberglade
Parsons, TN 38363

Jennifer Monroe
4299 Hwy 412 E
Parsons, TN 38363

Clara & Eugene Redden
11990 Mt. Carmel Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Debra Redden
11990 Mt. Carmel Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Jean & Larry Fisher
5175 Largo Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Penny & Clint Goodman
833 SW Street
Decaturville, TN 38329

Bobby & Ora Goodman
833 SW Street
Decaturville, TN 38329

Pauline Johnson
418 Largo Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Diane Britt
73 Yarbo Landing Lane
Decaturville, TN 38329

Fredrick Talley
1960 Iron Hill Rd
Parson, TN 38363

James & Clara Hamilton
535 Cedar Bluff Dr.
Decaturville, TN 38329

David & Robin Pulley
1115 Hwy 96 S
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Ginger Rhodes
2651 Roach Rd
Scotts Hill, TN 38374

Franklin R & Betty
Boroughs
2629 Bob's Landing Rd
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Roger & Haley Boroughs
2715 Bob's Landing Rd.
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Christie & James Delaney
2526 Hwy 69 South
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Ken Hill
13436 Mt. Carmel Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Patsy M. Yarbrow
13250 Mt. Carmel Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Robert Gage
53 Pleasant St
Decaturville, TN 38329

Clara Johnson
2561 Largo Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

William & Evon Smart
3186 Dunbar Road
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Sandra Kinchen
98 Yarbo Landing Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Susan Yarbo
6300 Mt. Carmel Rd.
Decaturville, TN 38329

Amanda Y Dill
13250 Mt. Carmel Rd.
Bath Springs, TN 38329

Deborah Holland
690 Sunshine Circle
Scotts Hill, TN

Teresa Bedingfield
165 Alan Miller Lane
Parsons, TN 38363

John C. Newman
1689 Old Stage Rd
Decaturville, TN 38329

Jerry B & Charlene
Armstrong
2390 Bobs Landing Rd.
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Wanda & Barney
Blasingim
2266 Bobs Landing Rd
Bath Springs, TN 38311

Danette Percy
59 Wheatstone Tr.
Decaturville, TN 38329

<p>Kurt & Melanie Holbert 600 Wheat Stone Rd Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Martha Potts 649 Crawford School Rd Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Rebecca Hayes 60 Georgia Ave N Parsons, TN 38329</p> <p>Patsy R Pratt 1176 Myracle Town Rd Darden, TN 38328</p> <p>Beth Roach 1645 Roach Rd Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Marie Potts 1000 Coy Johnson Rd Scotts Hill, TN 38374</p> <p>Vickie Collins 65 Bellywood Parsons, TN 38329</p> <p>Carolyn S Newman 1689 Old Stage Rd. Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Scotty Gibbons 86 Hickory St Decaturville, TN</p> <p>Roy & Lillian Gibbons 292 Cedar Bluff Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Roy & Cyndi Gibbons 15930 Mt. Carmel Rd Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>Pamela McGaha 8663 Three Way Rd Bath Springs, TN, 38329</p>		
---	--	--

Summary of E-mails “Before the April 20, 2010 Public Hearing” and TN APC response

<p>10. John Topper 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38329</p>	<p>Email from Mr. Topper sent 2/15/10. During the first 30-day comment period of January 20 – February 19, 2010.</p> <p>10a Mr. Topper had comments and questions about Tier 1 methodology and Tier 2 testing and why testing was done in December 2008 which was one of the driest periods for the county.</p> <p>10b A question was raised about what permit the landfill was under.</p> <p>10c A concern about unlined pits at least 20 years old when under the county management was expressed. Testing of (Tier 2) the unlined pits was suggested.</p> <p>10d Email from Mr. Topper sent 2/19/10 A comment expressed skepticism of self-testing (referring to EPA Tier 2 landfill testing) and reiterating concern about December 8-10, 2008 testing during one of the driest periods.</p>	<p>See entire email and response in Attachment 3 that includes emails of 2/15/10; 2/18/10; and 2/19/10.</p> <p>10a Tier 1 is a calculation of annual landfill NMOC emissions and is compared to 50 megragrams (Mg)/yr. If the value is less than 50 Mg/yr then annual emission reporting continues. If the value is more than 50 Mg/yr, then Tier 2 testing may be pursued as an option; which results in more accurate site-specific concentration d. Tier 2 landfill testing determines actual specific NMOC concentrations across landfill grids. This is then used to determine more precise annual NMOC emissions based on the amount of waste acceptance (mass of weight of waste received) rates. Once the landfill reached threshold capacity for Title V, that is more than 2.5 million cubic meters of volume and 2.5 million Mg of waste, then Tier 2 testing is done. The Tier 1 calculation and the Tier 2 testing are applicable or invoked at this dual threshold. Tier 2 testing was done in December 8-10, 2008 not long after the 2.5 million Mg of waste capacity was attained in August 2008 when Cell 3D began construction. Based on the 2008 waste acceptance rates and NMOC concentration measured, 13.7 Mg/yr of NMOC was determined for 2008 and represents only 27% of the 50 Mg/yr threshold. At 50 Mg/yr a landfill gas collection system would be required. The time of testing for Tier 2 does not preclude winter sampling. Testing must be sampled on landfill surfaces (two sample probes per hectare equivalent to 100 meters x 100 meters or 2.47 acres) that have had waste in place for at least two years and must be done according to EPA procedure per 40 CFR 60.754. The testing was also approved by TDEC and represents valid data.</p> <p>10b The facility has a solid waste permit (SNL-20-101-0254) issued by the TN Solid Waste Division (DSWM). An air permit (Title V) permit is being processed and is necessary when the dual threshold is met as described above. Thus, the TN APC is processing the Title V permit since the dual threshold of volume and mass was reached.</p> <p>10c & d. The Tier 2 testing was properly done and guidelines were followed. The report dated October 2009 discussed in detail Tier 2 testing on the landfill regarding the lined and unlined landfill areas. Rainy weather hampered testing. Testing was done by Richardson Smith Gardner & Associates and was observed by TDEC. Such testing is not considered self-testing and was done following an approved and prescribed EPA test procedure for landfills.</p>
---	--	--

<p>11. Pamela McGaha 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN38329</p>	<p>10e Email sent by Mr. Topper 3/2/10 (comment was after initial public comment period and before 2nd public notice that appeared 3/10/10 and 2nd comment period of 3/10/10 – 4/20/10)</p> <p><i>A comment and question was a solid waste concern about the service area served by the Decatur County Landfill. It was alleged that accepting waste outside the 75 mile area was done only if 600 tons per day was not attained under a contract item.</i></p> <p>10f Email from Mr. Topper sent 3/3/10 (comment was made after the initial public comment period of 1/20/10 and 2/19/10)</p> <p><i>The comments and questions from Mr. Topper were regarding who owned the facility and managed the landfill since it had gone through several ownership changes and legal transfers.</i></p> <p>11. Email discussion between Ms. McGaha and TDEC Deputy Communications Director contact Meg Lockhart including email exchange of 3/17/10; 3/19/10; and 4/9/10 are contained in Attachment 5 regarding Ms. Gaha's 2/17/10 letter to the editor of The News Leader entitled <u>Citizens of Decatur County deserve public hearing</u>. A copy of the editorial was mailed as a public comment to TN APC Director Barry Stephens.</p> <p>The following comments are contained in the editorial</p> <p>11a The county landfill is being operated without a gas collection and control system.</p> <p>11b The potential to emit the landfill gases will double.</p>	<p>10e See email and response in Attachment 4 which consists of emails of 3/2/10 and 3/3/10.</p> <p><i>The response to Mr. Topper's email 3/2/10 concern about the range or territory where waste is accepted and shipped to the landfill was addressed by a DSWM 3/2/10 email that stated this was not under jurisdiction of DSWM and the question should be directed to the county and the contractor Waste Services Decatur, LLC regarding any contract stipulations.</i></p> <p>This is not an air issue but the email and a TDEC response was supplied although this was after the initial public comment period of 1/20/10 thru 2/19/10.</p> <p>10f See email and response in Attachment 4 and this was also addressed at April 20, 2010 public hearing. As to the current Title V Permit being processed, Waste Services Decatur LLC, (WSD), a subsidiary of Waste Industries (WI) has been contracted to operate and manage the landfill for Decatur County. See Item 19j.</p> <p>11. A response to the main concerns and statements in the editorial were addressed based on the TDEC perspective. The response is based on information at hand, technical information and assessment, and state and regulatory air pollution requirements regarding landfills under the authority of TN APC.</p> <p>11a As previously stated, a gas capture and collection and control system is not required by EPA until 50 Mg/yr of NMOC is emitted. See previous APC responses to citizen comment 1c.</p> <p>11b The 2005 Title V application emission rates were based on the estimated waste to be received and were much higher than subsequent data indicated. When Tier 2 field testing was done in 2008 to obtain more accurate data, the annual actual emissions were considerably less due to the waste acceptance rate, 89,517 Mg /yr compared to previous estimates of 154, 292 Mg/yr. Thus, the emissions alleged to double did not reach the level or double as explained above. The 3/17/10 response by Meg Lockhart goes into more detail.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>11c Various pollutants and toxins expected to be emitted from landfills were mentioned.</p> <p>Email of 3/18/10</p> <p>11d Ms. Mc Gaha contends that all landfills should use best safeguards and control including gas collection and especially this landfill.</p> <p>11e Ms. McGaha stated that a Title V permit is nothing more than a permit to pollute.</p>	<p>TDEC rep Meg Lockhart also responded by email on 4/9/10 reiterating the above. It was stated that earlier values of almost doubling landfill emissions from the 2005 estimate to the current estimate was readjusted and more accurate due to more recent 2008 Tier 2 test data (field sampling concentration at the landfill) and more recent values for waste acceptance rate and waste in place at the landfill. Thus, the more current and relevant data best reflects the emissions. On-going evaluations and calculations of the amount of waste mass received, amount of waste in place, and landfill gas concentration represent the most current and accurate data for the landfill emissions.</p> <p>11c Decaying garbage releases methane, while other wastes release sulfides, and VOCs and solvents. These other gases represent a small portion of the total landfill emissions.</p> <p>11d TDEC/APC must implement the regulations and respective air pollution control it is authorized to follow. The EPA rule for NSPS 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW serves as the regulatory requirement that TDEC has in place in the air regulations. TN APC does not plan to go beyond the EPA requirements. Additionally, there is no regulatory authority to exceed the EPA requirements. If this was done it would not be consistent to the way other landfills in the state are regulated and permitted by TN APC with regard to NSPS and Title V air requirements for landfills. Until a GCCS is required due diligence will be ensured by checking on periodic reports and data required in the landfill air permit.</p> <p>11e TN APC utilizes and is required to include EPA air requirements for landfills in their Title V permits. If one is concerned about the air EPA requirements for landfill, they may write to EPA expressing such concerns and request an update of any forthcoming actions or possible changes. Such regulatory changes or revisions are announced in the Federal Register. EPA has in place two EPA federal air standards that can apply (1) NSPS 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW requiring Title V permits and (2) if above 50 Mg/yr of NMOC emissions, invoking NESHAP 40 CFR 63 Subpart AAAA to be added to the Title V permit, requiring a gas collection and control system.</p>
--	---	---

Summary of oral comments and TN APC Response “at the Public Hearing held on April 20, 2010”

Commenter	Topics and/or Comments (Item numbers listed)	TN APC Response indicates wording revisions)
12. Quincy Styke Deputy Director TN APC	12. Mr. Styke presided over the public hearing. He thanked Principal Robert Myracle of Riverside High School for allowing their facility to be used for the public hearing. Mr. Styke extended the written comment period through the close of business on Friday April 23, 2010. He introduced TDEC APC and Solid Waste staff present and allowed Mr. Pepper of WI to introduce those representing the landfill. It was mentioned that presentations would be made first that would hopefully address and answer some of the concerns and provide information on the air permitting and a perspective of management of landfills. He stated that APC had two public notices published, one for the Title V permit and then one announcing the public hearing (time, place and receiving comments). He explained the public hearing protocol, that he would call upon those that would speak in order, and moderated the public hearing. He noted that EPA would have their 45-day review after the comments and associated TN APC response were submitted. He addressed protocol for speakers instructing them to provide name, address and speak about matters related to air pollution, stating this was not a debate but a hearing to receive comments. He stated that at the conclusion of oral testimony there would be a session whereby Solid Waste and APC officials would be present to answer questions and have dialogue with interested parties.	12. Title V public hearings must follow certain guidelines and protocol to address the topics of concern, and proceed and maintain orderly conduct. It provides all stakeholders opportunities to make public comments for the record. Comments are addressed by TN APC and compiled and then sent to EPA for their review period. For those making comments, the consideration of others and addressing the issues of concern are needed.
13. Eric Flowers Chief of West TN Permit Program TN APC	13. Mr. Flowers spoke about the Title V permit process, how it related to the 1990 Clean Air Act, the thresholds and criteria that apply to landfills that can make them subject to a Title V permit, Title V permitting procedure, and public participation and interaction among interested parties during the Title V review process. See Attachment 6 .	13. An overview of the Title V permit process was explained and how this involves TN APC and the public.
14. Jim Attar Permit Engineer TN APC	14. Mr. Attar stated the landfill became a recent NSPS source operated by Waste Services of Decatur, LLC (WSD) since it met the dual thresholds for the design capacity of a landfill to have enough volume and corresponding mass to invoke Title V permitting. He went over the threshold criteria, the applicability of the NSPS rule 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW, Tier 1 (expected landfill emission calculations) and Tier 2	14. Specific federal regulations that affect landfills and proposed Title V permit conditions were explained. He provided a brief overview of this landfill itself and why it became subject to a Title V permit.

<p>15. David Pepper Area Landfill Manager Waste Industries Raleigh, NC.</p>	<p>testing to determine the actual NMOC concentrations at the landfill surface and extent of the landfill emissions, and mentioned specific Title V permit conditions. See Attachment 7.</p> <p>15. Mr. Pepper stated that a presentation on how landfills are structured and designed (geologic cross-section display) would be made. He stated that he had worked in the landfill industry for the last 23 years across the southeastern US. He serves as the area landfill manager for Waste Industries located in Raleigh, North Carolina. Our primary purpose was to discuss the Title V permit but he also wanted to address additional comments and concerns that the public had (past and current) and attempt to clear up any misconceptions about this landfill. He stated that few minutes would be taken to explain how a landfill is designed and operated to protect the environment. He stated that Waste Industries who has been in business for 40 years. He provided a slide of their 5 business principles reflecting their attitude and how they operate and treat others which is instilled in their employees. Waste Industries operates in 7 states and has 36 collection stations, 30 waste transfer stations, 10 landfills, 72 waste convenience sites, and 11 recycling centers. A map of the 7 states was provided. Mr. Pepper introduced three of his colleagues who he has worked with in landfills that involve Waste Industries. The entity Waste Services of Decatur, LLC (WSD) is a subsidiary of Waste Industries and serves as the contractor/operator for the Decatur County Landfill. He asked the local landfill staff to stand and stated they were proud of their staff. He then introduced Professional Engineer John Gardner of Richardson, Smith, and Gardner Consulting Engineers (RSG) who is registered in 13 states including TN and has 25 years experience in solid waste and landfill engineering and design. He stated Mr. Gardner would speak about the design features in a landfill referred to as Landfill Design 101 to help us understand what safeguards are in place to protect the environment. He then stated that Matthew (Matt) Lamb, Senior Project Scientist/consultant of RSG. (As an explanatory note, this company is now known as Smith Gardner Inc.) would speak after Mr. Gardner. Mr. Lamb is a project scientist who has over 15 years of experience primarily in the area of air permitting and compliance and Matt will speak on the specifics of the Title V process and talk about landfill gas and its characteristics</p>	<p>15. Parent company Waste Industries personnel and respective persons acting on behalf of the landfill were introduced by Mr. Pepper. Slide presentations were included but were not limited to slides on the 5 business principles and a map of the areas that Waste Industries for receipt at WSD covers. He mentioned what topics that three individuals on behalf of Waste Industries would talk about.</p>
---	--	---

<p>16. John Gardner Registered Professional Engineer Richardson Smith Gardner Associates (RSG) Raleigh, NC.</p>	<p>referred to as Landfill Gas 101. He then stated that Ms. Kim Frederick the local general landfill manager joined the company in 2005 and will speak on the daily landfill operations and what takes place in context of what John and Matt talk about in the way of landfill design.</p> <p>16. Mr. Gardner stated he is a principal engineer with the RSG. Over his 26 years he has worked in over 20 states and has dealt with over 200 landfills and has been involved with Waste Industries for about 10 years. He has worked on the WSD since 2004 and has been involved in solid waste permitting.</p> <p>There are typically 3 permits associated with landfills that include solid waste, surface water, and a Title V air permit. He emphasized he would deal primarily with the solid waste permit. A solid waste permit is broken up into a two-part process. The first part or Step 1 considers if the landfill site is indeed a suitable site for building a landfill. This involves a detailed study and report that must be done considering rock, soil and GW studies to see if the site meets the state rules. An approved landfill is a very heavily regulated type of site and must be highly engineered. It must be determined if the site can be monitored, has the proper setbacks and buffers considering airports, seismic zones, wetlands, streams, cultural resources and things like this. A detailed application (often filling multiple ring binders) is submitted and if acceptable to the solid waste department they issue the site suitability determination to the landfill applicant. Being approved, Step 2 follows and then the applicant can submit the detailed design of the landfill. The design will ensure the GW, surface water, and air quality are protected.</p> <p>Mr. Gardner then went over the anatomy of the landfill demonstrating a “to-scale” model of each section of the vertical profile of the landfill that the audience could see.</p> <p>Starting at the bottom is the geological substrate buffer or sub base that has to be in place in order for a liner to be placed on top the sub base. In Tennessee the sub base is anywhere from 5 to 10 feet thick depending on the quality of material that serves as the geologic buffer that has to be in place naturally in order to site a landfill. Once this is deemed suitable we can go to the liner system above that. We are talking about 10 feet of clay now. Clay serves as a barrier to make this structure as impermeable as possible to liquid contaminants. The clay contains microscopic plates that help prevent</p>	<p>16. Mr. Gardner provided an overview and had a model display depicting a cross-section of the components of a landfill that were to scale. He explained this in the context of solid waste design going through each layered structure of the landfill from the geologic buffer at the bottom to the surface of the landfill. The components of structural design and principles and mechanisms that occur below grade were explained in detail. How the environment was protected by proper landfill construction and design was explained.</p>
---	--	---

or impede liquid passage and thus contamination to underground water tables or aquifers. It is the opposite of sand that allows water to pass through it. This geological buffer is required to be constructed of clay. So we have a 5 to 10 feet thick clay system with a liner system on top of this. We have a liner system now like a bath tub that essentially contains the bottom and sides of the landfill. Then above that we form a drainage system so that any rainfall or snow fall that percolates through the waste and carries contaminants with it and that liquid forms a leachate. The leachate sits on a liner system. The liner system contains the leachate and the leachate collection system above it evacuates the liquid. Once the leachate that collects on the liner reaches a depth of 1 foot it must be removed for collection and storage or treatment. Above that layer, we have a granular drainage layer and above that we have a protective cover so that nothing can shove through the liner system. Then the waste is placed.

On top of the clay geologic buffer is another 2 ft. clay liner where soil tests are done and then compacted at 4 six inch layers. Atop this is a synthetic geomembrane liner typically a plastic high density polyethylene or HPDE 1.5 mils thick (20 times thicker than a garbage bag) and is highly resistant to all chemicals and solvents. This is placed together with the clay to form a composite (clay and synthetic) liner. These geomembranes are delivered to the site in 23 feet wide rolls where they are welded together in the field and tested on each side of the weld. Every square inch of the membrane is tested in the field for the base and sidewalls of the landfill. The membranes are certified and approved before they put the next layer on which is the drainage layer which helps collect the leachate. An analogy was given. Leachate would be the coffee beverage that forms as you pour hot water (rain) through the coffee grounds (waste). So the landfill leachate is collected on site and stored and then hauled off and treated at a permitted facility.

So on top of this composite liner system we put our drainage system which is a series of pipes and stones that sits on the liner and it evacuates the liquid off the liner. Once the leachate that collects on the liner reaches a depth of 1 foot it must be removed for collection and storage or treatment.

So one has 10-15 feet of protection on the landfill from bottom to sides. Once the cell is constructed, you have the first lift of waste

<p>17. Matthew (Matt) Lamb Senior Scientist Richardson Smith Gardner Associates (RSG) Raleigh, NC</p>	<p>that is called the fluff lift which is not quite as compacted so it helps protect the liner system in place. Then the full operations begin and Kim Frederick will speak more about actual landfill operations.</p> <p>So as the cells or units are built one at a time as we fill from below grade to above grade we have our final slopes on the landfill. We come and build our final cover system over the entire site. This is comprised of another sheet of geomembrane and is seamed at the edges with this liner system so it seals it in like Tupperware and entombs the waste. After this is placed on the final cap we place drainage layers and soil layers above this. So when one goes by you have vegetated hill. You know you underneath this you have a cap system, a liner system, a geological buffer and a pretty good container. Again, pretty highly engineered.</p> <p>Once a landfill is closed the owners are required to conduct post closure care for the next 30 years after the closure. This is a long term deal. The company is then required to maintain, monitor, and report on the facility for that duration. With that I will turn this over to Matt Lamb and he will describe landfill gas inside the landfill.</p> <p>17. As John Gardner and David Pepper mentioned, I am here to give a broader overview of the permitting process as it applies to Decatur County Landfill and to discuss landfill gas (LFG) and any concerns you may have relevant to the operation of the landfill and gas production. As to my background, I am with RSG Associates and have been with them coming up 7 years now. Prior to that I was in the environmental field for 15 years mainly dealing with air permitting, air compliance, and air monitoring issues.</p> <p>So in order to address your concerns, we will go through a series of questions in what we call Landfill Gas 101. The main question is what exactly is landfill gas? LFG is predominantly made of 17a carbon dioxide and methane which are greenhouse gases (GHG). This is a concern but such GHG are generated from many other operations other than landfills such as livestock and agriculture and so forth.</p> <p>Where does the LFG come from? The gas is generated from biodegradable trash that we throw away daily. As the trash enters the landfill, it is covered with more trash and dirt and as mentioned before it is sealed off from</p>	<p>17. Mr. Lamb discussed gaseous emissions 17a (GHG and CO₂ are now included as part of Title V air emissions besides criteria pollutants) and EPA calculation and test procedure from landfills and relevant air pollution matters. He discussed these matters and used slides in his presentation. He went into gas generation and emissions from landfills, what LFG is, how it is produced, where it is emitted, and the factors that increase the extent of gas generation. He briefly addressed the threshold for MSW Title V permitting and the parameters that affect the LFG emission rate. He then addressed sampling of landfill</p>
---	--	---

	<p>any contact with air. Now to put this in plain English the banana peel we throw away goes to the landfill and is covered with dirt and cut off from air. The bacteria that live in the garbage will begin to digest the peel and break it down and in this process they begin to produce the gas we mentioned. This is similar to the process in our stomachs with the rest of the banana. So we now know what the gas and where it comes from.</p> <p>The next question is where does the gas go? Initially it can sit in the landfill in pockets for periods of time but eventually the gas is going to move up, down or sideways. The WSD has a liner system that acts as a bathtub or Tupperware container that stops gases from leaving the sides or bottom. This is verified by WSD by monitoring outside the landfill. In the next slide you see a GW monitoring well that is monitored on a periodic basis. The next slide shows a methane monitoring probe which has a port on top where the gas is drawn into an instrument which reads the level of LFG. The probe is installed in the soil to detect any possible movement of gas through the soil. So just as gas is prohibited from moving out the sides and bottom of the liner system, it is also prohibited from moving up through the cap of the landfill except where vents have been installed in the cap to control pressure.</p> <p>17b The next slide shows such a cap where a flare has been installed in WSD. These flares have been installed voluntarily as mentioned by Jim Attar and are not required by the permit. 17c They control odors before they become a nuisance. Here you can see the flare shortly after being installed at WSD. The flame is not visible in daylight but you can see it at night and it is approximately 5 - 6 feet tall flame from the flare stack. From the base of the flare to the tip is about 10 feet tall. At the flare tip you have a spark igniter similar to a spark plug in your engine that receives a constant signal from a solar powered battery. The battery keeps the spark igniter running 24 hours a days so that if the flame is blown out by high winds or for other reasons the spark will relight the flare flame if there is sufficient gas for combustion. This is for operation in the cap area of the landfill.</p> <p>Gas can also move up in surface areas that are active areas or areas that have not yet been covered by a cap.</p> <p>17d The final question is why are we here and why does the site need a Title V permit? Referring to the detailed answer that Jim Attar gave earlier, the landfill has reached the</p>	<p>gas and at what point a GCCS would be invoked according to Title V emission criteria.</p> <p>17b He also mentioned the 3 passive odor flares powered by a solar powered battery with a continuous spark igniter that keeps a continuous flare flame going.</p> <p>17c These flares were installed voluntarily in 2006 and are used to help abate odors by burning some vented landfill gas.</p> <p>17d A landfill will need a Title V permit only at the point it reaches a certain size (mass of waste and volume of storage) as specified by EPA's rule.</p>
--	--	---

size it that requires a Title V permit. It has a capacity in place and a permitted capacity to accept waste that requires a Title V permit.

When the size was reached, EPA allowed testing to be done to see how much gas was being produced by the bugs and banana peels that we discussed earlier. So now not only is WSD is required to sample for gas in the soil and GW around the perimeter of the landfill 17e but the Title V permit moves sampling into the landfill itself. As the sampling is performed and if the results show that the gas generation reaches the threshold level (50 Mg/yr NMOC) set by EPA then a gas collection system is required to be designed and installed in a certain period of time. Based on the results of the WSD gas sampling, mainly as a function of the low amount of gas and relatively low amounts of garbage brought in over a period of time, the gas (NMOC) is well below the level requiring a collection system. From that perspective we have compared that gas generation from another typical landfill in the state. This is a larger landfill that has taken in much more trash over a shorter period of time and as a result the gas generation is much higher. While bigger landfills may have enough gas to warrant a gas collection system, the WSD just doesn't produce enough gas to require a system and to be honest may not produce enough gas to be effectively captured. As operations continue over time, the Title V requires this resampling to be performed over time and if future results show the gas amounts cross the EPA levels at that point a system will be designed and installed within a certain period of time.

17f Also, as Jim Attar said, if the rate of waste acceptance increases at the landfill, then reporting will have to be resubmitted as well.

17g Until then, gas will continue to be flared to control odors voluntarily as part of the best operating practices of WSD.

To further discuss these operating practices, I would like to introduce Kimberly Frederick, General Manager of WSD.

17e EPA has allowed certain published and prescribed procedures for landfill gas (NMOC) emission determinations and sampling. Specifically, these are Tier 1 (emission calculation) and Tier 2 (gas concentration sampling across the landfill grid surface). Gaseous landfill emissions are an increasing function of the amount of mass of waste and the waste acceptance rate. Tier 2 has a more refined and accurate value of NMOC emissions to determine if the threshold for a GCCS is reached.

17f Title V requires recalculation of NMOC emissions based on yearly waste acceptance which is one of the parameters of the emission calculation equation.

17g The 3 small voluntarily installed flares will continue to assist in odor abatement but can never be expected to control odors to the full extent such as a centralized flare system. Landfills will always release odors from the daily working of trash into the landfill surface and the decaying matter odors released at the landfill especially at surface openings.

<p>18. Kimberly (Kim) Frederick General Manager Decatur County Landfill</p>	<p>18. Ms. Frederick spoke on behalf of the Decatur County Landfill staff and their daily operating practice. She is General Manager for the WSD.</p> <p>Now that we have heard how the landfill is designed and engineering, I am going to spend some time on what we do on a day- to day basis at the landfill.</p> <p>This is the entrance to the landfill. 18a <i>Part of our daily operation is litter pickup and sweep. Every truck is weighed in and out so that we can track the amount of waste that is disposed of at the landfill. When the truck gets to the tipping area, the driver opens the back of the container and using rear load trucks or raised beds they dump their waste. They pull forward and close their truck or container at the tipping area as a means of helping us to control litter. The dozer will then push the waste and we have a compactor that will come in and pack the waste.</i> 18b <i>Compacting is done for numerous reasons - for litter control, odor control and it allows us to increase our air space, the density in the landfill and we can get more garbage in a smaller area so the landfill will last longer. At the end of the day all waste is covered with 6 inches of dirt. Four inches of dirt will kill a fly egg. Six inches of dirt will control odor, litter, and ensure that all fly eggs are dead.</i></p> <p>18c <i>In 2009, 78,000 tons were received at the landfill. Of that over 99% was from household and commercial customers. We keep a record of every load that is received at and from and all of that information is turned over to the state on a quarterly basis.</i></p> <p>18d <i>We also monitor GW around our facility and there is an example of a GW monitoring well. You should know that WSD does not sample nor test our GW. All sampling and testing is done by an independent engineering firm and laboratory and they report the results to the state. Here is an example of a gas monitoring probe. This is also is done by a third party. They connect the instrument to the probe to detect the presence of any gases. There have not been any GW or gas problems at WSD.</i></p> <p>18e <i>Here is a picture of the leachate tank at our facility. All leachate is collected and stored inside of this tank. The leachate is then pumped into this tanker and it is transported to a permitted facility in Jackson to be treated. Leachate samples</i></p>	<p>18. <i>Ms. Frederick discussed the local management of the landfill including solid waste practices with responsibilities and measures taken for odor and litter control, leachate recovery and sampling, ground water monitoring, and appropriate landfill practices currently being used on a daily basis.</i></p> <p>18a <i>Litter control practice was discussed.</i></p> <p>18b <i>The daily landfill practices described including compacting waste, daily ground cover, and litter containment measures such as litter pickup and truck cover all help minimize odors.</i></p> <p>18c <i>Per cent of household and commercial waste and annual tonnage received.</i></p> <p>18d <i>Groundwater monitoring discussed.</i></p> <p>18e <i>Leachate collection, handling, and sampling were discussed.</i></p>
---	---	--

19. David Pepper	<p><i>are collected monthly and sent overnight to be tested.</i></p> <p>We have 9 people at this facility who work hard every day and take pride in what they do. <i>WSD is a sanitary disposal facility and not a dump. This is for your safety as well as ours.</i> I hope this had been helpful in helping you to understand the things that Matt Lamb and John Gardner have been talking about are not just pie in the sky. It is happening here in Decatur County. Thank you and with that I will turn this back over to them.</p> <p>19. The following is David Pepper's second set of oral comments that were made to address some citizen concerns and questions that were received prior to the April 20, 2010 public hearing:</p> <p>I want to wrap up our portion of this evening by attempting to answer a few of the comments, questions, and concerns we heard leading up to this hearing this evening. I will attempt to be brief in my comments. As Mr. Styke indicated earlier, we will be available after the public comment period on the Title V permit and once that is over we will stick around along with some of the TDEC solid waste department. So with that being said, we will go through some of the things that we heard from you and concerns that you had. I hope we have answered a lot of those in the presentations that have already been made.</p> <p><i>There were concerns first of all about GW and surface water protection. We have already talked about that this evening and the design of a liner system and the mechanisms used to prevent leachate into the environment. I want to point that these methodologies have worked and we expect them to continue to work. These methods are proven over time, not only here but in lots of other places and our experience tells us that they will continue to work. It does not surprise us and it is what we really expect.</i></p> <p>19b The second concern we heard from you was regarding gas collection system and why isn't there a GCCS required at this facility? Hopefully after Matt Lamb's presentation and Jim Attar's presentation you now understand 19c that there actually is a voluntary system in place already with three flares installed to control odor and those were installed in 2006. I should point out that because of the small amount of gas</p>	<p>18f <i>Work ethic of the landfill employees.</i></p> <p>19. Mr. Pepper provided a corporate management perspective, that of Waste Industries the parent organization of WSD. His comments on the landfill encompassed environmental matters, (air, land, water) truck traffic handling waste, litter control, in-coming waste projection rates, ownership history capacity, and other related matters. Many of his statements were made to be informative about landfill design and operation, clarify information, and to address questions and concerns that had been brought up prior to the public hearing regarding citizen inquiries, concerns, and comments. The citizen comments prior to the public hearing were received by APC and TDEC via correspondence, email, with occasional phone calls to APC and TDEC. As stated in the public notices, written comments are accepted for the record and any oral comments at the public hearing are for the record. Some of the citizen comments were directed to the Decatur County officials (County Commission) dealing with the landfill or to the contractor operating the landfill, WSD.</p> <p>19a <i>Protection of GW and surface water are ensured due to an effective liner system restraining leachate from reaching and contaminating same. The mechanisms and systems were considered to be reliable as proven over time.</i></p> <p>19b & d Mr. Pepper addressed air related concerns about a GCCS and why one was not used at this time.</p> <p>Although the voluntary odor flares are helpful and a GCCS would be beneficial, EPA regulatory requirements are not required for a GCCS at this stage of operation for WSD due to low amount of gas generated.</p> <p>The Title V permit will in fact have requirements to</p>
------------------	---	--

	<p>generation that takes place at this facility because the long period of time it is taking to take in the amount of waste that triggers the Title V permit in the first place, that two of the three flares that operate at the facility rarely run because there's just not a lot of gas coming out to burn. But they do speak to our business principles and we will be proactive. We will protect the environment and the surrounding community. 19d In fact when gas is generated in sufficient quantities that Matt Lamb talked about and when we hit the threshold of 50 Mg/yr where a GCCS is required, we will be looking at this much more frequently. 19e As we begin to see the amount of gas that is generated we will be actively pursuing some sort of beneficial reuse project at this facility. Right now we just don't have the capacity and amount of gas generated to support that kind of investment. But to give you an example we are indeed installing a 12 megawatt (MW) electric facility at one of our larger landfills in NC and because there is a sufficient quantity of gas there we have the ability to install such a system. That would happen here in time but it's just not there right now.</p> <p>19f Thirdly, we heard from you regarding traffic and litter on the roads. I just wanted to let you know the order of magnitude of traffic associated with the landfill. Last year we averaged about 25 trucks per day delivering waste to the landfill. That represents less than 1% of the traffic on Highway 69 south of Decaturville so that is less than 1% of the total traffic that is going to the landfill.</p> <p>As Kim Frederick mentioned as mentioned part of our standard operating practice is to pick up litter on and around the landfill and this includes Three Way Road.</p> <p>Fourthly, we heard from you how much waste and where does it come from and there claims of us receiving waste from NYC and other places out of state.</p> <p>19g In 2009 we received just over 300 tons per day based on 5 day work week. As Kim mentioned this waste is primarily being generated by households and commercial establishments much like your local fast food and retail stores.</p> <p>19h So where does it (the landfill waste) come from? We have this slide here. In the middle is Decatur County and what you see is not exactly a circle but there is a 75 mile radius from the perimeter of Decatur County. This is the permitted service area</p>	<p>monitor and calculate NMOC emissions and reassess waste density on a regular basis (annually). Title V pertains to municipal waste landfills.</p> <p>19c He also addressed that at times there is a low amount of landfill gas that is produced so that some of the odor flares were not able to sustain combustion. Passive flares rely on a source of ignition (a spark igniter provided by a solar battery) and sufficient fuel (methane) to keep the flare lit to maintain a continuous burn or flare.</p> <p>19e Mr. Pepper stated economic and feasible reasons for collection and handling of landfill gas for alternate or beneficial uses such powering engines that can run on collected landfill gas when there is sufficient landfill gas present.</p> <p>19f The average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume for TDOT Station 61 south of Decaturville on Highway 69 was 352 for the year 2009, a published value. At an average of 25 trucks per day at the landfill in 2009, this represents 7% of the daily traffic volume of a state highway near the landfill.</p> <p>19g This current landfill daily tonnage of 300 tons/day compared to 600 tons/day of waste is the main reason for the difference an earlier higher estimate of landfill gas emissions.</p> <p>19h Origin of waste brought in to WSD and area of service was discussed.</p>
--	--	---

for this facility. It allows us to take waste from any county that this line touches, so this allows AL, MS, and KY. So there are a few counties in southern KY, northern AL, and northern MS that we can receive waste from. It does not mean that we are obligated or that we do but they are possibilities. However, there are 8 counties including Decatur County that are nearby that we received 99.2 % of the waste from last year.

So you can see that this facility is truly a small local regional landfill. Those counties generated that 300 tons per day that I talked about earlier. Less than 1% of that was industrial waste from that service area and if you are familiar with that service area there is not a lot of industry in that area. However, each time a waste stream from an industrial process is being considered for disposal, the generating entity facility has to submit a request to the state agency to dispose that waste at our facility. The technical staff at TDEC reviews that information and makes a determination that yes this is something that this facility could receive for disposal.

19i We heard concerns about leachate management practice. Kim Frederick talked about sending the leachate to a permitted facility in Jackson. That is not unusual and this is the most commonly practiced disposal methodology across the country. The hauler is a licensed hauler for that type of product. Some have suggested that we should recirculate that leachate back into the landfill rather than haul it. One should understand that this facility is somewhat small and it would not take very long for the amount of waste at this facility to become saturated. That creates all sorts of operational issues with leachate and it increases the rate that gas becomes generated at the landfill. One of the lacking items that the bacteria or organisms needs is water in order to survive. They need food and water. So when you pump the water back into the landfill you fill that void and that creates that degradation process and that can create a problem with regard to odors.

19j One individual within the community has raised the issue of Waste Industries not being the legal entity to operate the facility. You should know that we operate under an agreement with Decatur County to operate the landfill for the permitted life of the facility and are responsible for the care of the facility after its operating life. The question may best be asked this way. Why is

19i Handling of the leachate at WSD was discussed.

19j Mr. Pepper provided the history/chronology of waste entities that contracted to operate the landfill with Decatur County from the beginning to the current state served by WSD.

WSD operating the landfill when the landfill agreement indicated that Waste Services of America is the operator? The answer is simple and non-controversial. The landfill agreement was entered in 1996 between Decatur County and Waste Services of America, Inc. (WSA). Sometime between 1996 and 1999 WSA assigned the agreement to its wholly owned subsidiary Waste Services of Decatur, LLC (WSD). WSA was clearly permitted to make this assignment under the agreement which provided that quote:

“The County by execution of this agreement hereby consents to the assignment of this agreement by WSA to its wholly owned subsidiary.”

Then in January of 1999 WSD entity was acquired by Waste Industries in a merger transaction where WSD became a wholly owned subsidiary of Waste Industries (WI). The next question may be: Did that transaction, that merger that I just described, breach the landfill agreement? In particular did it breach the provision that restricts assignment? First I would like you to know that WI is very experienced in the area of acquisitions and puts a great deal of effort into ensuring that all required consents are obtained. In this transaction our legal team and the legal team of WSA came to the conclusion that the merger did not trigger a consent requirement under the landfill agreement. This conclusion was even discussed with the county officials prior to closing. No one indicated any disagreement. However, following the merger the county did raise a question. The parties resolved the matter by entering into an amendment to the landfill agreement in December of 2000. The purpose of this agreement was to put to rest any argument that the merger could have been in breach of the agreement. The amendment provides that quote:

“The County by its execution of this agreement hereby consents to the assignment, transfer, or delegation of this agreement by WSA to WI or to any entity owned by WI.”

The parties have been operating under this agreement ever since.

You may have heard or may hear later tonight words like illegal, unlawful, or invalid. But simply using these words and repeating them does not make it so. In calling something secretive or surreptitious

20. Quincy Styke	<p><i>is not appropriate when all facts have been made available and the process went through the proper channels as they have in this case.</i></p> <p>And the last comments or questions that I would like to address are statements like Leave everything the same or don't allow the landfill to grow. 19k We saw many comments like this indicating a desire on the part of the residents of the county to leave things the way they are. Several of you indicated you had move here recently due to the beauty of the surrounding countryside and you didn't that upset by the issuance of this permit. You should know that the landfill has been operated under the current permit (Solid Waste Permit) at this same location since the early 1990's.</p> <p>19l As we have already discussed with you this evening this Title V permit does not allow any more emissions from the landfill than before the permit was issued. It simply requires closer monitoring and reporting than has previously been required. It does not allow more or different types of waste nor does it dictate where waste is allowed to be received from. These items are governed by other documents not this air permit. In summary the issuance of this permit does not change the status quo in these areas.</p> <p>As I wrap and turn this over to Mr. Styke, let me thank you for your attendance. I want to reiterate that because this is a public hearing, we will not be answering your questions nor having dialogue with you as you make your comments or ask your questions tonight. TDEC will respond to those comments and questions following tonight's meeting and the days to come but we will be available following the hearing tonight to answer questions about things we have discussed. We will do that more on a one-on-one setting and afterwards we will be available along with folks for the solid waste department and TDEC as well. So with that Mr. Styke I will turn it over to you.</p> <p>20. Thank you David (Pepper), Matt (Lamb), Kim, and John (Gardner) for that presentation.</p> <p>I make an observation as I sat here listening to this, just how important the work of Principal Myracle and Mr. (Tim) Wilson is. I was just looking at how clean and spotless this building is and how important the job you do to teach children and students math and science and how important it is for them</p>	<p>19k This deals with effect of the landfill on the aesthetics of the county landscape. This dedicated landfill site serves a purpose to handle solid waste and has its own features, purposes, and design and will be different than other land use and landscape features within the county.</p> <p>19l The Title V permit will in fact have requirements to monitor and calculate NMOC emissions and reassess waste density on a regular basis (annually). Title V pertains to municipal waste landfills.</p>
------------------	--	---

<p>21. Pamela (Pam) McGaha 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38329</p>	<p>to learn these things and this is a great venue to be here where students learn.</p> <p>I also, as Mr. Gardner was building the model, I'm 58 and I lived in Dyersburg when I was a child. On Sundays for fun we would go to the dump and shoot rats and there were all types of burning things out there, smoke, smells, rats, and roaches and it was always a treat to come up on a TV with a picture tube and get to shoot that and watch it implode. I wish some of you who have never seen that could of have seen what open burning dumps were. What an eyesore and an abomination to the community they were and how important is it to have these highly engineering facilities where our wastes are properly received, contained stored and managed throughout the states of decomposition that they go through. So this type of facility is a very important facility to all communities. We generate waste and we have to do something with that waste and we have to do it in a responsible manner.</p> <p>I hope as you have heard all of these comments tonight, I do realize a lot of regulations and rules have been thrown out, it is important to know that all these requirements are based on science and law and public policy and design that make sure we are managing waste in a responsible manner and that the public is protected and that's what this is all about.</p> <p>Now that we come to the portion of the public hearing where we hear from you. Again, I will say we have three cards where I will be calling people up. If you feel compelled to come and speak, I invite you to come and speak and register your comments at the public hearing.</p> <p>So with that, the first person I will call up is Pam McGaha. Please state your name for the record, your address, and keep your comments focused on the air pollution control aspects of this meeting. Pam McGaha.</p> <p>21. Thank you. I wish I had the Power Point back up and the sighing (sp?) happy people behind me too. They make it sound so rub-a-dub-dub, got some banana in your tummy. That's not the way it is folks. Corporations have been taking over and Decatur County is faced with a corporation that has no vested interest in this community and they are only interested in garnering private profits at our expense. I want to say the first thing, I've got so many things to say and I don't even know</p>	<p>20. Mr. Styke reminisced about how city and county dumps were many years ago (1960's) and then compared them to landfills today - being highly engineered and regulated. He then opened the public hearing to the citizens and residents for their oral comments for the record.</p>
---	---	---

where to start. I feel like I have been watching an hour and 20 minute infomercial on how wonderful Waste Services or Waste Industries or Waste Services USA or Waste Services of Decatur- how wonderful they are. You know this is not 1958 anymore and we don't burn trash anymore, thank God, but I don't think we are being given a very appropriate vision of what is going on at this dump. I guess I don't know where to begin to start.

21a I'll start with the fact that reason this Title V permit is being applied for is because without the Title V permit, 21b the landfill will be forced to install gas collection system and monitoring system. That's the reason for the Title V permit. Because without it, the Title V will allow them to continue their operations. The landfill has grown. It has not been there a very long time and the landfill has grown exponentially. And it has gotten large enough now that they have to have this permit or else they have to install these systems.

21c *And it's not, listen, I hear 25 trucks a day, ya'll, I live by that landfill and there are 25 trucks in the morning and they come night and day.*

21d And we talk about the methane that comes out of your belly and out of your animals. This is not just methane, people, it is volatile organic compounds, truly there are a lot of those. This dump is also pumping dioxins into our air. They are pumping aluminum, lead, toluene, benzene. I could go down the list.

21e While ago I believe and I could be wrong, but I swear, I thought I heard Mr. Pepper say they put in 30 tons a day and then the second time he did say 300 tons a day, a little over 300 tons a day. I find it extremely strange, because in the landfill application which has been made in the name of Decatur County folks, we have signed a contract with these people and we are kind of stuck into this thing. This is being made in our name. And in their permit application in 2005 they state that they take in 600 tons a day. Now they are saying a little over 300. I don't know. I do know that garbage is a big business bought and sold like soybeans and cotton so I find it hard to believe that they're having such a tough time keeping this landfill open.

21f *Someone mentioned earlier about the 30 transfer stations. Now Mr. Pepper, you were not at the County Commission meeting*

21a The reason for a Title V permit for a MSW landfill is due to federal requirements for permitting when any municipal waste landfill reaches a certain size for **both** waste mass and storage volume. A Title V permit can be issued without a GCCS if emissions are below the 50 Mg/yr NMOC level. Also, a Title V permit will contain stipulations for a GCCS when the emissions invoke a GCCS system. Either can occur. The rule is consistent across the nation.

21b The GCCS system has been previously addressed and can be put in place once the level of emissions reaches the required threshold of 50 Mg/yr of NMOC. Test data for this landfill has shown it has not reached this level.

21c *The amount of traffic and associated data has been discussed in 19f.*

21d Gaseous emissions exist both toxic and non-toxic. The primary emissions from landfill gas are from methane from the decaying waste. Non-methane organic compounds (NMOC) constitute a small amount of the landfill gas (less than 1%) with some hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). Other gases are also released. The Title V application estimates the 2005 emissions from methane at 2724 tons/yr, CO₂ at 7474 tons/yr, NMOC is 17.6 tons/yr, VOC 5.4 tons/yr, HAP, typically VOC, is at 3.6 tons/yr and includes toluene, benzene and various other volatile organic compounds. Aluminum and lead are buried and retained underground and accordingly are not released into the atmosphere since they are particulate matter. Gases however can migrate through openings in the surface and are released at the landfill surface.

21e Ms. McGaha is correct. Although the 2005 Title V application stated 600 tons per day is a design capacity, the landfill has been receiving far less waste than 600 tons per day. In 2009 waste was less than 300 tons per day and this trend of waste acceptance continues.

The owner of the landfill (MSW) is Decatur County and is managed under contract with Waste Services of Decatur, LLC.

21f *The origin of waste cannot be verified by TN APC and is not an air pollution comment and more suited as a TDEC Solid Waste question that permits and has*

	<p><i>but it was admitted to by the people who came and spoke to us that a lot of that garbage is coming from transfer stations. Now a transfer station is where someone from New York City parks their truck so they are just a few miles away from Decatur County. They bring in waste from God knows where.</i></p> <p>21g And if you talk to people the smells are horrendous.</p> <p>I want to try to get back to some of the things I'd like to talk about. We don't deserve this. These people are going into small communities where people don't have a lot of money. 21h <i>The county has no legal representation. I'm sorry Mayor Scott but our county's lawyer worked for Waste Services so he cannot tell the county what to do in this situation. So Mayor Scott went through another lawyer who gave them an opinion. I'm sorry we all have opinions and his may have been a legal one but this county at least deserves a lawyer in this situation. And we are being run over like no body's business.</i></p> <p>21i <i>I've been told they are not working at night and they are working at night and I'm talking about trucks rolling in and out. I'm talking about big trucks rolling in and out.</i></p> <p>And just don't know what else to say. 21j <i>The people of this county have a right to clean air and I'm sorry but I get a very distinct feeling that there's a lot of all are so good the way you do this garbage and I think</i></p>	<p><i>the landfill track such waste and its origin.</i></p> <p>21g Refer to response 4d. All landfills will have odors at times due to several factors such as prevailing winds, humidity, moisture, temperature, type of waste, etc. While waste is being buried and exposed to the air, odors can occur and during the decay process. It is acknowledged a GCCS with a flare would help destroy odorous compounds and destroy hydrocarbons at 98% or better. This would help with odor but the landfill NMOC emissions are well below 50 Mg/yr. Current landfill practices in place at WSD include covering of trucks with incoming waste loads, use of 3 odor flares, one in the leachate cleanout piping and 2 handling passive vent gas, minimizing the operating face (active landfill area being worked buried and then covered daily), adequate ground cover (6 inch ground cover daily at end of the operating day). In Jan 2013 a geosynthetic rain cover was placed over Cells 3A, 3B/C, and 3D to mitigate liquid infiltration and leachate. This can decrease landfill gas generation to the air. Landfill personnel have requested anyone report time, duration of odor and/or odor/fog to the landfill office so they can investigate the conditions going on at the time of the complaint or concern. TN has no odor laws.</p> <p>21h <i>The local county legal representation is not an air pollution related comment.</i></p> <p>21i <i>Traffic from the trucks transporting the waste and leaving the site has also been expressed as a concern by other residents.</i></p> <p>21j <i>The concern for a right to clean air is duly noted as an air quality concern.</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>hand shaking and oh ya'll are so good at the way you do this garbage and I think you are mistaken.</p> <p>21k There's one thing I want to ask. Everyone keeps bringing up about the 2.7 megatons or 2.503 mega grams or megatons. How much is that? Is that millions? When someone says 2.503 million mega grams, how much is that?</p> <p>Quincy Styke replied: A mega gram is a thousand kilograms or one million grams. A kilogram is about 2.2 lbs. per kilogram so it's about 2200 lbs per megagram or a metric ton.</p> <p>So a megagram sounds really small but its' really...</p> <p>Mega means million</p> <p>So it's really 2.2 million pounds? See, that's what we are really looking at ya'll. I'm sorry I'm not trying to attack you. But all night long I've not heard anybody say how many pounds of trash. I heard mega grams and million cubic feet.</p> <p>Jim Attar: 2 1/2 million mega grams is 2.756 million tons.</p> <p>Well, Why don't you say 2 million pounds instead of saying 2.7? That's just the type of thing that really disturbs me.</p> <p>21l I vehemently oppose this thing. 21m I think that we deserve to have, what do they call it, the maximum achievable control quality? 21n I don't think that our air ought to be polluted any more than it already has been. I think the people of this county should insist that we be allowed, that they be forced, and that's another thing at the county commission meeting that someone says the County of Decatur would have to pay for those quality controls and I challenge that statement.</p> <p>21o So we've asked things of TDEC. We ask one question and we ask one question and we get 10 different answers. And people say we're sorry come back with something else. We deserve better. We really do deserve better.</p> <p>Quincy Styke: Thank you Pam.</p>	<p>21k This comment deals with EPA's use of units within their rule. EPA uses metric units for the landfills and APC has used both English units and metric units for cross reference. A megagram (Mg) mega = million thus a million grams and one gram is 1/454 of a pound, 2000 lbs per ton, thus 1 megagram is 1.1 tons. It has to be translated into English units (tons) but it is EPA's choice of units in their standards for this rule not TN APC. So the 50 Mg/yr of NMOC emissions is 55.1 tons/yr and the 2.5 million megagrams (Mg or 10⁶ grams) of waste is equivalent to 2.756 million tons of waste.</p> <p>21l Opposition to the Title V permit is duly noted.</p> <p>21m The GCCS has been discussed in 21b. APC cannot force the landfill to install a GCCS system but as the landfill gas reaches the required emission level this requirement will be invoked.</p> <p>21n This is duly noted as an air pollution concern.</p> <p>21o The public hearing responses, this comment and response summary, and previous email responses hopefully clarify the position or address the regulatory requirements, landfill issues, and what the landfill is currently committed to and what practices are in place. Proactive landfill practice and limitations and constraints have been explained and discussed.</p>
--	--	---

22. John Topper
8663 Three Way Road
Bath Springs, TN 38329

The next person and I believe I've got this right – John Topper. Name and address for the record please.

22. John Topper:
Name and address - John Topper, 8663
Three Way Road, Bath Springs, TN, about a
mile and a half off the dump site.

I'm not too much at public speaking but I'll
take a grab at this.

22a I've asked Mr. Pepper and I've asked other people about how did we come to... I was the one he was speaking to about it ...How did we get to where we are? Who, where there are, and how did they get there. I have my hand here on four different stories of how we arrived or I should say Waste Industries (WI) arrived at the landfill. One is from their lawyer which... I will be reading a part of.... was from an email sent to you that I received through you from Eliza Emmett who is an attorney for ya'll. She told one story. The other story is told in a court action by Gerald Gresham of Waste Services of America (WSA) in which it states WSA was just a landfill speculator. Remember that they signed a 30 year contract with the County but within two years of signing that contract WSA was gone. Now, if I gave you a contract for 30 years and you disappeared and all of a sudden your cousin showed up, I'd have questions to be asked. My problem is that this transfer... I understand that they bought... WSA bought or created, I should say, Waste Services of Decatur (WSD) which was a TN LLC (limited liability company). But what is interesting is they got them up a WSD NC. (North Carolina). Now you notice their sign down there doesn't say NC it says WSD. Well, they say they bought and bargained and merged the two companies. Well, in the merging of the two companies they feel that the landfill operational rights should have gone with the company. Well, the 1996 contract says you can't do that. They've got a statement there that says "Hereto", which means it deals with the individuals that were in the original contract which is WSA and Decatur County. But what WI says Oh no, we put in that 2000..(end of Tape 1)

Change over from Tape 1 to Tape 2 of the
public hearing recording.

That meant that the people that were there

22a This comment is about the number of waste contractors managing the landfill and how this transpired. Refer to Mr. Pepper's detailed chronology of landfill companies and/or firms and LLC that entered into contracts to manage and operate Decatur County MSW Landfill. This involved some corporate transfers. Refer to comment 19j of Mr. Pepper.

for the amendment which is not true. You can't have it both ways. Two wrongs don't make a right. WSA walked away from the landfill. They didn't walk away they sold it for. I think it was for 12.4 million dollars. And in in 2000 WI comes back to the county and says. Look let me straighten this all out. We're going to give you the end all, the be all of this thing, we're going to come up with the first amendment to this contract here. And when they came up what they did was they changed two or three words and took it 180 degrees. All of a sudden WSA is gone and WI is in the ball park. Now they used different excuses for being there but basically they've been here ever since. And God love um and everybody has got to work and I understand that but I don't understand why they can't come up with a story that flows rather than goes here stops, somebody else tells another story, goes here stops, someone else goes here and stops again. That's what I say four different and four different stories. None of them making any sense and we're coming to a conclusion. I've asked Mr. Pepper and I have asked Mr. Tate and I have pulled him in and I've drained his brain, I do believe, with questions.

22b Several years ago we had a little problem down here with a company called TN Aluminum Processors (TAP) that they brought aluminum waste in and the problem was that this stuff reacted to water and moisture and caught fire, so they removed it.

22c So I went back and I reviewed all the information that was available to me about TAP and I came up with these charts (TRI documents) that show what they transported and where they transported it to. Now, the strange part is that WI is not on this list. This list goes to 2008. On this list it is registered as WSA, now why is that? Mr. Pepper says it's because the aluminum company thought that WSA was still running the landfill. I'm sorry but, you know, but I'm sure somebody paid something for something and there had to be an invoice going somewhere that said this was WI and not WSA.

22b Mr. Topper is correct about aluminum waste such as aluminum dross reacting with landfill water and with the potential to cause a problem. This has been observed in other landfills in TN and other states where aluminum dross is buried resulting in exothermic reactions and chemical reactions, releasing emissions such as ammonia and other volatile compounds when aluminum dross and its impurities react with any water that it comes in contact with in the landfill. The landfill stopped receiving aluminum and aluminum dross several years ago.

22c Mr. Topper is correct in stating that there was a discrepancy on the TRI report that he was referring to of Tennessee Aluminum Processors, Inc. on the proper name of the waste transfer site destination that the aluminum waste was shipped to. On October 19, 1995 WSA was filed as a corporate entity in FL and is no longer active. Mr. Topper's comment is well taken and it should have no longer been listed as WSA as the waste recipient but listed as WSD on the TRI report. The TRI report should have been consistent and stated it was Waste Services of Decatur, LLC (WSD), although WSD was listed correctly once. For all other years it was listed incorrectly as WSA. The site address for the receipt of the waste was Bath Springs so it indeed went to Decatur County Landfill managed by WSD. When listed on this TRI report, this was apparently a carryover from the previous name that the shipper did not properly state as the recipient.

	<p>22d And the other issues I'll raise will be with TDEC in reference to the material that was shown on these charts with reference to the 2005 request (Title V application) and the 2008 testing (Dec 2008 core testing of the landfill using grid sampling for NMOC concentrations) and now the 2010 landfill permit (drafted Title V permit). That's a long time between ranks of order. Why did it take so long? What was that caused by? Why didn't this thing go through in 2005? And why are passing a permit with Mayor Broadway's signature on it and not the present Mayor?</p> <p>22e <i>And we all know that Decatur County is responsible, liable, whatever you want to call it, at what happens at this dump. And all due respect, 30 years down the road I can't buy that. Thirty years down the road they said they would buy the landfill. How much is it worth? It sold for 12.9 million dollars. What's it worth at the end of the 30 year cycle? How much are they going to pay for it? And what is it going to be worth to us? I mean we have to live by it. I'm like you, I'm one old enough to be one that's gone to the dump and shot rats lying around and saw what open burning did to things. This to me is just like a big blister with little packets of blisters sitting out here waiting for the time and ticking down, tick, tick, tick. I don't know but the last thing I saw was that those liners were guaranteed for what 30 years. There not a life time. They're going to give way after a while. That's not to say they are not giving away now.</i></p> <p>22f They've got two cells out there from the old dump the landfill that are unlined and that bothers me because I don't know what's in them. I don't know if they took a core test or anything else to find out what's in there and whether they're more dangerous than the ones that are lined. 22g <i>But the lined ones are just waiting to happen you know 50 years from now they're going to pop and the clay in the ground, this example right here, is what's supposed to stop them.</i></p> <p><i>This is the best technology for today and I understand that and everybody is doing the best job they can.</i> But we went from burning it to burying it. Neither of which is any good for us. It doesn't serve the purpose. We need to find out a new innovative way.</p> <p>22h I just wonder whether those flares that you have placed out there and the gas leak that comes off of them that you are burning if</p>	<p>22d Regarding the Title V application and APC processing of this, refer to 1a. response and a chronology of APC in handling the Title V process. Current contacts will be reflected on the permit and any other personnel changes.</p> <p>22e <i>The liability, life of the clay liner, life of the landfill, and fate of a landfill are solid waste issues that APC is unable to address. The engineering and reliability of solid waste management, practices and equipment can be best be answered by DSWM. These on-going decisions that Decatur County must face must involve discussions, reviews, and studies whereby the county, contractor, and consultants are all stakeholders.</i></p> <p>22f See responses to 10a and 10c & d. Currently, EPA has a prescribed Tier 2 sampling procedure for landfills. Test methods and procedures are updated as needed. If valid technical comments are received by EPA, they take such comments into consideration. This in some cases can result in a revised or amended procedure published in the Federal Register it is deemed appropriate and sufficient comments are received.</p> <p>22g <i>The liners design and duration are solid waste issues and evaluating and implementing improved solid waste landfill management is an on-going process.</i></p> <p>22h Combustion of landfill gas is the primary method of controlling landfill emissions. There is limited flaring only handling 3 small flares for odor control</p>
--	--	---

<p>23. John Alexander 1120 Bailey Road Reagan, TN 38368</p>	<p>we didn't do that would that gas flow? Would that gas diagram be the same or would it be different? Basically, you're just burning off what's coming out of the ground instead of storing it and checking it. So the flow chart that you have and blue line going across there and of course if you open the vent and burn it you won't have the buildup and that's a good idea but it's burning off the methane into the atmosphere.</p> <p>22i And what happens to that is that it separates if I am correct, I'm not a scientist but it separates. And the particles go their different ways and they land in my backyard and your backyard and everybody else's backyard that lives around here. So that's why air pollution, that's why these people are concerned about air pollution, it doesn't stay in one place. Now, I think we are getting our dose of it.</p> <p>22j <i>This thing has been here for 20 years at least. And we are looking for 30 more years and after that 30 years; it's the creeping giant. We don't have enough garbage to fill it up after 30 years so we're going to extend the contract. Then we get into the position of having too much garbage and not enough space. Well, that's where we let the county take over and then eminent domain to annex the land. So it's a creeping giant we're stuck it. I don't think we really are but I talk to you about it, I talk to the Mayor about it, and I talk to everybody else about it.</i></p> <p>Some people call me crazy. I've been called worse than that. I'm 64 years old and I'm craaaaaazy as a fox. So I'll leave ya'll with it. Thank you sir.</p> <p>Quincy Styke: Thank you John. The next person will be John Alexander. State your name and address.</p> <p>23. My name is John Alexander and I live at 1120 Bailey Road. I wanted to take my chance in stepping behind this mike tonight. Because what people don't realize is that I have the privilege of working for this wonderful company. I try to live my life as a good Christian man with good Christian ethics, good Christian background and upbringing. I try to live honest and try to put in a hard day's work. And the thing is, this company has supported every ounce of integrity that's instilled in me. And the thing is, this ain't just corporate jargon, this ain't</p>	<p>where there are outlets due to structures crossing the landfill surface.</p> <p>22i Flare combustion has very little particulate matter and tends to combust the gaseous compounds such as hydrocarbons. Thus, no appreciable particulate fallout, if any, would be expected to be emitted or reach residences. Gaseous emissions are more predominant with particulate emitted at a minimum rate. Gaseous concentrations are diluted (lower concentration) the further the distance from the origin. The downwind dosage is considered an air quality concern alleged to affect Mr. Topper's residence with possible long term effects.</p> <p>22j <i>The timeline and future planning for the landfill is primarily a solid waste issue and concern dealing with ways to handle the amount of future waste received, waste storage capacity needed, and on-going maintenance and care-taking as the landfill undergoes various phases of landfill life cycle.</i></p>
---	---	--

<p>24. Paula Roach 6613 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>just big wheels from the big city coming in here to ruin your home, this is local people. Whenever Mr. Pepper asked the people who lived here, who grewed up here, born and bred, your neighbors we're the ones that worked there. We worked there everyday. Nothing happens on that site we don't see and we don't know. 23a <i>There is nothing in this world that would ever make us do anything to harm our family, our friends, our neighbors, our community. This company has sent several of us to school to know the danger signs, the things to look for. And the thing is ya'll, everybody in this room sends their waste somewhere.</i> 23b <i>And all the other issues that were brought up and all the legal mumbo-jumbo that's been throwed out there were brought up to make this company look negative to you tonight.</i> This meeting has nothing to do with none of that. 23c <i>This is about a Title V permit.</i> 23d <i>This company keeps people on site every day to go out to monitor, to look, to keep an eye on this place because the thing is, it's not just your kids, it's our kids. You think we don't want to keep it clean. You think we don't want to make it the best place we can. The thing is, the people who work there, the people that know what's going on, especially me, I can speak for John Alexander.</i> 23e <i>I support the Title V permit.</i></p> <p>Quincy Styke: I don't have a card for this lady but she has promised to give me her name and address for the record. Thank you.</p> <p>24. My name is Paula Roach. I'm not a public speaker so forgive me if I get sidetracked here. I have lived in the same spot for 36 years. The landfill was a mile from me about 20 years ago. I don't have a problem with you people that work there. I've known a bunch of you personally and you are good people. That's not my problem. I don't care when you're operating. What</p>	<p>23a & d As an employee of the landfill (WSD), Mr. Alexander asserts he and other landfill workers do as much as possible to protect the community by responsible and conscientious management of the landfill. The operating practices and management of the landfill employees is taken seriously and is intended to help control litter, minimize odors, and address air quality concerns/quality of life.</p> <p>23b <i>The questioning by one previous commenter of the transactions and history of waste management firms and legal transfers previously discussed in detail for the companies that were contracted by Decatur County to manage the landfill was mentioned. Mr. Alexander stated the history of transfers of the waste management firms was not relevant to the hearing or the Title V process. The county and the current legal waste management entity (contractor) are the ones held responsible to abide by the Title V permit requirements.</i></p> <p>23c <i>Mr. Alexander emphasized that public hearing comments and decisions need to be focused on the Title V air permit and not side-tracked on other peripheral issues such as the past waste contractor entities that handled WSD and dealt with Decatur County.</i></p> <p>23e <i>He expressed his support for moving along with the Title V permit. It is not optional for TN APC to not process and not issue a Title V permit. The Title V application has been submitted as required due to the EPA threshold criteria. Both the waste mass and waste storage volume criteria have been met. Title V puts into place current and any future air pollution requirements, if applicable, when the amount of NMOC emissions increase to the 50 Mg/yr amount. Periodic determination of the landfill annual emissions is evaluated.</i></p> <p>Ms. Roach is a resident near the landfill who lived there before the landfill was built and relates her first-hand experience in living in the vicinity of the landfill and how it affects her and her family. Her main concerns deal with the landfill gas, smell, associated effects on her health, and impacts on her residence and residential activities.</p>
---	--	--

<p>25. Larry Marshall 1748 Bible Hill Road Parsons, TN 38363</p>	<p>does affect me I've ate your bananas that the peel goes to the landfill and the gas I pass did not bring tears to my eyes or choke me up or cause me to have headaches. 24a But the peels that cause gas up there a mile from your landfill prevents me from opening my windows, grilling out, 24b and causes us to have headaches. In the summertime I cannot run the air conditioner. 24c In the wintertime brings the heat it pulls in the smell in. 24d It's not an everyday thing. Thank God, I would have to relocate. It's not an everyday thing. But it is often enough that it is causing a hardship on me. 24e Some of my family have respiratory problems. It's really hard on them. 24f If you are at that point that it is questionable now as to whether or not you need this (gas collection and containment system) put in, show that you care for the county and go ahead and do it for the ones that you moved in on. I've been there. I didn't move there on top of you. I lived there and you moved in on top of me, so if you care as much about us as you say you do and this is all about the community, go ahead and do it and remove any and all possibilities that gas is getting out there, 24g cause I smell it., 24h It does affect me and that's it. 24i I'm not complaining on anything else, it is strictly about the air pollution.</p> <p>Quincy Styke asked for her address for the record.</p> <p>I'm sorry. I am at 6613 Three Way Road, right down the road from you in Decaturville.</p> <p>Would you fill out one of these (cards) please for Linda please, Paula.</p> <p>I sure can.</p> <p>Thank you, Paula.</p> <p>Is there anyone else that would like to come to the mike and speak at the public hearing?</p> <p>Yes sir, in the green shirt.</p> <p>25. Larry Marshall.</p> <p>Larry Marshall, could you approach the microphone so the recorder can capture you, Larry. Larry, before you go back after your comments, would you fill out one of these (cards) and give it to Linda please. I'll leave it on the podium. Larry Marshall.</p>	<p>24a, d, i, Interference of landfill air emissions with residential outdoor activities and fumes entering a residence are considered to be an air quality concern that impairs her quality of life.</p> <p>24b, c, e, g, h The health effects and odors are closely tied together in Ms. Roach's situation.</p> <p>Refer to the odor issue responses in 4 and 21. Her comments also address health issues. Ms. Roach and possibly other individuals appear to be more sensitive to the odors and gases from the landfill, resulting in more adverse health effects that some other individuals may not experience to that extent.</p> <p>The landfill gas and associated odors are detected at times, but not every day according to Ms. Roach, but at times affect her health and that of her family. The landfill gas and odors are an air quality and quality of life a concern.</p> <p>24f TN APC cannot require a gas capture and control system at this time due to the level of the landfill emissions. This was previously mentioned based on EPA federal air rules (NSPS) since the emission criterion of 50 Mg/yr of NMOC has not been reached at this stage of landfill operations. WSD has stated that due the low level of gas generation, a GCCS system such as landfill wide gas collection and flare system or diverting landfill gas to engines for combustion is not feasible at this stage of the landfill operation.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>25a Thank you for this opportunity to address these entities and the people here. I've heard different complaints; I've heard different solutions, the way the landfill works. I think one of the biggest problems we have is, just listening, is a lack of communication. I don't know if a lack of communication is on the company, the entity that runs this industry, or if it's on our county government, Mr. Scott there and the County Commission. Somebody in common sense should be doing a better job of communicating with the citizens of Decatur County. They never know what's going on.</p> <p>25b You know, and it's up to this company or if it's not up to this company, then Mayor Scott and our County Commission should step up to the plate and tell the people the truth, the facts, if this is a safe situation. But before now, now some of the people here, they are pretty much informed, they get their statistics. But in general this is another form or reasoning of government in this county. Nobody is ever informed us of what is going on in Decatur County, so therefore, things that might not be a problem tends to be a problem. It seems to me that the more educated the general public is, the more they hear and they listen and they accept things of operation of the county and that's all I had to say. But somewhere, somebody is not doing a good job of communicating what's going on in Decatur County Landfill to the people of Decatur County.</p> <p>25c Now, I hear things people say - Well trucks, you know, very simple there could be a way of surveillance. They can prove how many trucks go in or not, that's very simple to do.</p> <p>25d But I honestly believe if we can pressure or at least ask the people, ask this entity or this agency or Mayor Scott and the County Commission to keep us informed of what is going on, then there may not be so much animosity towards the thing because I've said again, we need a well-informed public.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Quincy Styke:</p> <p>Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to approach the microphone tonight, anyone else? All right. I will recess this</p>	<p>25a, d. In general Mr. Marshall's comments are not air related and suggest better communication issues between the landfill personnel, the landfill management firm, Decatur County officials, TDEC/TN APC and the citizens. However, his concerns indirectly refer to Title V public participation process. Mr. Marshall's phrase "this opportunity to address these entities and the people here" is essential to public hearings. The public hearing, hopefully allows citizens and other public hearing attendees and/or participants to be aware of the implications that Title V has in relation to processing an air permit for the landfill and provides the public a venue for oral comments at the public hearing. The written comments are the other portion of the public participation process.</p> <p>Mr. Marshall alludes to some possible withholding or not sharing information or simply a failure to communicate to the people of Decatur County. This could include information that could be shared regarding current landfill practice, management and caretaking.</p> <p>25b Whether this is a safe situation could refer to many things such as solid waste landfill practice and/or air pollution concerns. This will be assumed to be an air pollution matter. At the public hearing air pollution control matters were addressed as well as solid waste and water pollution issues. The APC response summary also addressed this matter.</p> <p>25c Since the number of trucks passing through the vicinity of the landfill was a concern at the public hearing and also from the written comment, establishing an accurate value or extent of the traffic was a concern by citizens, though not an air issue. The TDOT statistics and the landfill records of the trucks entering their premises provide a reasonable estimate of the truck traffic. See 19f to compare the landfill traffic volume to that of a nearby Highway 69 Station.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Mr. Quincy Styke concluded the main session for the oral air pollution comments. He then allowed and held a concluding session for those with Solid Waste questions/comments other general comments. This was done as a courtesy since Mr. Ron Potts of the Division of Solid Waste in the Jackson EFO was present and available. Solid waste permits for this landfill were issued by TDEC DSM at Jackson. The following is provided to list those comments and are also listed for information purposes.</p> <p>26. Ron Potts TDEC Division of Solid Waste Jackson Environmental Field Office</p> <p>27. Lady #1 (did not state her name, but said she</p>	<p>public hearing, the oral comment portion of it, I want to remind you that we will receive written comments until this Friday April 23 4:30 PM Central Time at our Air Pollution Division Control office in Nashville and once again that address is:</p> <p>9th Floor, L & C Annex 401 Church Street Nashville, TN 37243-1531.</p> <p>Quincy Styke:</p> <p>All right, so I will recess that. Now it is 10 till 9, Air Pollution can answer a few comments. The Division of Solid Waste Management is here to talk to you. Are there any questions about air pollution that we can speak to tonight? If we don't know the answer, we'll find an answer and get it back to you. All right.</p> <p>Ron (Ron Potts), do you and your team want to make a comment or anything?</p> <p>26a <i>We're available to answer any questions that anybody might have on the operations of the facility in regard to Solid Waste Management. If anybody wants to stand up and ask any questions we'll be glad to answer them.</i></p> <p>Quincy Styke: Okay, the lady in the back.</p> <p>27. <i>I live on Bob's Landing Road. Sometimes when we come home in the</i></p>	<p>26. <i>Mr. Potts volunteered to be present at the public hearing and address solid waste issues although the public hearing was not intended to be about solid waste issues or a solid waste meeting. TN APC appreciates his presence and availability at the hearing.</i></p> <p>27, 28, 29. <i>Trash spillage or litter from the waste trucks found along the roads in the vicinity of the</i></p>
--	---	---

lived on Bob's Road	<i>afternoon after work, there's trash all over the road. In fact I saw a lady out there in eight inches (?) of it. I don't know if it falls out of the truck or... It looks like there's some on the road, on Bob's Landing Road it comes off.</i>	<i>landfill was a concern. Securing the trash from the waste trucks was suggested to help mitigate litter. Whether all trucks were solely under the authority of the landfill was not established. If spillage continues to be a regular problem, the landfill management should look into directives to minimize trash spillage from the vehicles. Landfill management should ensure that all truck drivers follow the directives the landfill has in place for responsible handling and covering of their loads to avoid spillage and deal with spillage all the roads.</i>
28. Lady #2 (did not state her name)	<i>Isn't it true that a lot of the trucks that come in(sentence wasn't finished) Are all trucks owned by ya'll? Aren't they owned by other people too that come in there?</i>	
29. Lady #3 (did not state her name but said she was a former truck driver)	<i>Well, you see they control their own trucks. I can make these comments because I used to be a truck driver. Really, they ought to have their loads covered and all that, but they can't control trucks that aren't theirs.</i> Wording on the following comment could not be fully discerned for transcribing. The following is what appeared to be said.	<i>After follow-up on this concern, it has been reported by WI that approximately one third of the trucks are owned by WSD and the other two thirds are third party haulers. The trucks are required to be covered. Litter pickup is routine at the landfill. As part of a good-faith effort, there is some pickup of litter on local roads as needed.</i>
Lady #1	<i>They could be shown signs or could be tied down or something.</i> Due to numerous people talking, some at the same time, the full conversation about trash on the road and comments could not be clearly transcribed.	
Lady #2	<i>But that's probably a good suggestion maybe they can get them all to say: Hey if you're going to come here you've to tie your loads.</i>	
Lady #1	<i>We don't want all that paper, banana peels, and garbage bags and that stuff over our roads.</i> Quincy Styke: Yes, comment question.	
30. Joshua Corey (phone listing shows 1884 Bob's Landing Road)	30. My name is Joshua Corey. I live on Bob's Landing Road also. <i>I just want to thank everyone for coming out and saying what you had to say. But whoever decided to have a conversation where we're going to say this then you're going to say that, but we are not going to discuss it? It's not that hard to read off a cue card and show a diagram that a first grader would understand but a conversation with another human being is on a different level. Whoever made that decision should definitely think it through. That's about it.</i> Quincy Styke: 31. Thank you Joshua. <i>I will just comment that public hearings, the format of a public</i>	30. <i>Mr. Corey questioned the protocol and procedure used in conducting the Title V public hearing. The implications were toward what was allowed to be said, opportunity for rebuttal, restriction on dialogue, and extent of discussion.</i> 31. <i>Since this was a public hearing for an air pollution source subject to a Title V permit, the intent and</i>

<p>31.</p> <p>32. Quincy Styke concluded the evening session dialogue, thanking the high school hosts and staff and local law enforcement.</p>	<p>hearing is prescribed by statute and regulation. We have to follow that. I don't want you to think for a moment that TDEC does not want to have that humanistic one-on-one or group-on-one conversation; that's a very important element of what we do. We are pleased to do that. I just had to say for the public hearing, I had very specific statutory, regulatory requirements that I had to follow. So, you know, as they say, I didn't write it, I'm just preaching it. Thank you Joshua.</p> <p>32. Any other questions comments tonight?</p> <p>Well again, I want to very much thank Principal Myracle (Principal Robert Myracle of Riverside High School in Decaturville), Mr. Wilson (Mr. Tim Wilson - Custodian of High School), the law enforcement officers here tonight. Wonderful venue to come out to speak and learn about what's going on in your community. I am very pleased that you came. If you have any questions, please feel free to give us a call. Thank you again for coming out tonight.</p> <p>Applause</p> <p>(End of tape recording of public hearing)</p> <p>Mr. Styke had previously announced the public comment period would be extended and additional comments could be received through April 23, 2010.</p>	<p>purpose of the hearing is to receive comments from any participant regarding air issues relative to Title V matters. Accordingly, a prescribed procedure was used to conduct a public hearing and was followed. This was not a debate but allowed any party to express their view, observations, concerns, and information about this matter for the record.</p> <p>32. The Division of Air Pollution Control and TDEC are extremely appreciative of Mr. Myracle and staff in accommodating the APC staff at a location suitable for local residents and participants and providing resources to conduct the Title V public hearing. This was not only for only for the benefit of the state but for the community so this important issue could be discussed and comments could be recorded for the record. The Division also thanks the local law enforcement officers present for ensuring a safe and secure venue to assist in maintaining order as needed.</p> <p>An additional written comment period was extended to close out the week for any final or additional comments.</p>
--	--	---

Summary of letters received and TN APC response after Public Hearing during the Extension Period April 21- April 23, 2010

The following 7 letters including a letter with a report are contained in **Attachment 8**.

<p>33. Paula Cordle Roach 6613 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>33. The following letter was dated April 22, 2010 and received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>To Whom This May Concern:</p> <p>I spoke at the meeting the other night and I just wanted to take a minute to ask you once again before you make your 33a decision to deny their permit until they install a gas containment system. 33b I love my community and have lived here since I was 4 years old. I have roamed over every inch of my family's 100 plus acres and have come to appreciate the beauty and tranquility in nature. This is one of the things that I have missed most with the landfill being so close to us. 33cThe smell that comes from the gases they are emitting 33d and the thick fog that comes when the smell is so bad. I hired the lawn done last year because picking days to mow the yard when there is no rain or no landfill gases in the summer is near impossible. 33e I pick up garbage from my yard on a daily basis left from the garbage trucks, replaced more mail boxes than I can count on my fingers and toes taken out by garbage trucks, took in many of the dogs that have been dumped at the landfill, and have ran off the road to avoid being run over by garbage trucks because they can't stop at a stop sign. With all this being said I say nothing because they are my neighbors, they are a business in our county, they bring business to our county and to be honest we all have neighbors that we have to go out of our way for just to get along. I do feel like the landfill is doing what they can to protect our water supply. I think they supplied plenty of evidence of that at the meeting. 33f They, however, did not supply any evidence that they are in fact willing to protect what I am breathing in. I have a choice in what I take into my body but with the landfill I have no choice. I am forced to breathe the fumes, suffer from headaches, 33g and wrap up in blankets so that I don't have to turn on heat and bring the fumes</p>	<p>Ms. Roach reiterated and expounded her concerns that she had previously expressed at the public hearing which included opposition to the permit, the need for installing a GCCS system, and interconnected odor, and health issues.</p> <p>33a Permit denial was suggested contingent only upon the landfill installing a GCCS. TN APC cannot require the gas collection and control system as previously mentioned based on EPA federal air rules since the emission criteria of 50 Mg/yr of NMOC has not been reached at this time. Once this level is reached a GCCS will be required.</p> <p>33b Being unable to enjoy one's property or mow one's lawn is considered a quality of life concern alleged to come from landfill gases.</p> <p>33c Refer to the odor issue responses in 4, 21, and 23. Ms. Roach and some other residents in the vicinity mentioned similar complaints as well.</p> <p>33d Thick fog has been observed that carried with it an unpleasant smell. Fog or mist can occur when conditions are conducive and may or not come from the landfill. Fog or mist can cause condensation of the gases particles and transport any associated odors with the gases it contacts</p> <p>33e Waste trucks damage to personal property (mail boxes) and driving safety issues from waste trucks impacting local citizens were personally experienced. Water quality protection was not a concern.</p> <p>33f Ms. Roach appears to be more sensitive to the odors and gases from the</p>
--	--	--

<p>34. Mark Roach 6613 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>inside, suffer from the hot weather as opposed to running air conditioning because of the fumes coming inside. I have to purchase air freshening units to keep the smell down when the landfill is smelling so strong. It has gotten worse over the last 5 years and you can tell a difference year to year. I did not choose to move near the landfill they chose to move near me.33h It is their obligation to the community in which they say they care so much about to install the gas containment system to make our lives more bearable. I have went above and beyond my duty as a neighbor and feel that they should do what is right to be accepted as our neighbor. 33i I am asking you to please deny the permit until the proper gas containment systems are installed at the landfill.</p> <p>Thank You</p> <p>Paula Roach 6613 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329 731-614-5156</p> <p>34. The following letter was dated April 22, 2010 and was received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>To Whom This May Concern:</p> <p>I live about a mile from the landfill and have lived here about 4 years now. 34a In the 4 years that I have lived here the smell has gotten continually worse. 34b I have an 8 year old child and enjoy cooking out, camping in the back yard, riding 4 wheelers and doing all the outdoor stuff with my child that most dads do. There have been many times and are more frequent now that outdoor activities are impossible here. 34c The smell is unbearable and when the smell is so bad it hurts your eyes to be outside. If you leave your windows down on vehicle you will smell the landfill inside your truck all day. Raising your windows in your home lets the smell settle in the house. 34d This cannot be good for people to breathe. I am aware that the people working there deal with this on a daily basis but they choose to</p>	<p>landfill and apparently may be more adversely affected by this than others</p> <p>33g Objectionable fumes and associated odors entering a residence are primarily an odor concern but are also considered interference with quality of life and an air quality concern as well. She alleges that outside air laden with landfill gas compromises the use of her residential heat and cooling system unit since such objectionable air is circulated inside her residence. They have installed 3 odor nuisance flares.</p> <p>33h As previously stated a GCCS would be voluntary on the part of the landfill owner and management since they are not required to do so at this stage of emissions under EPA NSPS regulations.</p> <p>33i Opposition to the permit is duly noted. APC cannot deny the permit based on lack of a GCCS which is not legally required at this time as was previously stated.</p> <p>34a Mr. Roach asserts odors have become worse over recent years. He objects to odorous fumes that enter his home and vehicle. This is also a quality of life concern. Refer to previous odor responses.</p> <p>34b Interference with residential outdoor activities with his family on his property due alleged landfill fumes is considered to be a quality of life concern.</p> <p>34c Mr. Roach attributes odorous fumes at times to result in a health issue for him causing his eyes to burn while outside.</p> <p>34d Interference of landfill air emissions (air quality concern) with breathing and</p>
--	--	---

<p>35. La Chanda Re White 6653 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>work there and get paid for doing so. I do not get paid to breathe that mess a mile down the road and should not be forced to be confined in my own home or outdoor activities 34e because they don't want to pay for a gas collection system that is needed to operate their own facility. They say they are doing everything they can do and staying within government guidelines to protect the community in which they operate. This should not be a big deal for them to continue to protect us by installing what is needed to allow the community to enjoy their homes and outdoor activities on their properties without having to smell the landfill 34f and suffer from headaches and burning eyes due to the gases they are producing. 34g My wife was told by the lady (Kimberly Frederick) at the meeting to call her the next time the smell was unbearable. The next morning she called the landfill to tell her to come to our home and take a smell. She was informed that the lady was out of town on business and would not return until Friday. Something has got to be done if we wait even another 6 months it is only going to get worse. 34h In the 4 years that I have lived here the smell has gotten more frequent and stronger 34i and you can actually see a fog at times. In another 6 months people further away will be affected and it will be much worse here. I am asking your board to please enforce the law on gas collection. This problem is real and if you can't take my word on it feel free to come stay at my house for a week then decide,</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mark: Roach 6613 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>731-549-3849</p> <p>35. The following letter was dated April 22, 2010 and received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>To Whom This May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing in regards to the Landfill in Decatur County. I am a 22 year resident of Bath Springs area living at 6653 Three Way Road in Decaturville, TN. I am located right at a mile downstream</p>	<p>the act of leaving his house for outside air are an air quality concern affecting the quality of life.</p> <p>34e Mr. Roach repeated and re-emphasized the need for a GCCS for him and his wife and for the good of the community and quality of life. Refer to previous responses on when a GCCS is required by EPA stipulations to be installed. A GCCS can help but is not expected to fully control all the odors that exist at a landfill, such as wastes being buried during the day. No regulatory requirement to have a GCCS has been broken as alleged so the TN Air Board/ TN APC have not failed to enforce the law.</p> <p>34f Mr. Roach reiterated his previous health concern of burning eyes and also mentioned headaches.</p> <p>34g This involved his wife reporting an odor complaint to the landfill staff and it was alleged landfill personnel did not address their concerns or make themselves available so they could report a landfill odor concern right away.</p> <p>34h Odors were alleged to occur more often and to be more intense over the last 4 years.</p> <p>34i Fog can occur at a landfill or on the property near a landfill if atmospheric conditions are right or any moist place in the area if conditions are right. Refer to 30b response.</p>
--	---	--

from the landfill. When the landfill was first started on Bobs Landing Road, aside from all the usual complaints that a landfill has, it was not that bad. You could go out and do whatever you wanted and didn't notice they were just down the road aside from the garbage trucks now traveling Three Way and Bobs Landing Road. 35a *However over the last 5 years the air quality outside has diminished.* 35b *It started off occasionally smelling the 5 years ago to being unbearable at times now. In the early morning hours you can always smell the landfill but will normally get better as the day continues. My biggest complaint is that many days that has been consistently getting worse over the last 2 years* 35c *you can walk outside and actually see a foggy mist over the fields here and the smell is unbearable.* 35d *It causes your eyes to water and causes headaches. I suffer from migraine headaches and if you know anything about migraines then you know smells can trigger them. When I get a headache it causes me more problems than a simple Tylenol can control. I get sick to my stomach, sensitive to light* 35e *and noise is unbearable which includes the trucks turning onto Bobs Landing (I live at the intersection of Bobs Landing and Three Way).* I completely understand that they have a business to run and respect the fact that day-to-day operations may not be accommodating to my needs. 35f I also understand that the gasses they are producing are what I am seeing and smelling at my house and it is getting worse. 35g *If they are allowed to continue to run for a minimum of a year without some kind of gas collection or gas control system it is only going to get worse,* 35h *I know that unless you live this close to a landfill you cannot not possibly understand how bad it has got or how much worse it will get until something is done to control it.* 35i *According to the information that I understand from the meeting they are at the point where something is required and it is your job to hear the comments and decide if they can continue to operate with or without a gas containment system. I am asking you to please for the safety and comfort of the residents living within a mile of the landfill to force them to install a gas containment system.*

LaChanda Re White
6653 Three Way Road

35a *Air quality degradation near the residences due to landfill gases is considered an air quality concern.*

35b *Odor was alleged to increase the last 5 years. Due to morning inversions, air masses and thus odors can be trapped in the morning as well as the evening. Air dispersion improves as the day goes on and odors would be expected to diminish or end the afternoon.*

35c *A fog /mist was mentioned by Ms White as well as 3 other residents living in the vicinity of the landfill who commented about observing a fog.*

35d *Health issues including eyes watering, headaches, and stomach issues were reported. Odors or smells were an alleged trigger or cause for migraines for Ms. White, resulting in sensitivity to light and a sick GI feeling. Ms. White's health appears to be more adversely affected due to the fumes and odors.*

35e *Although traffic has been mentioned as an issue, this is the first mention of noise from truck traffic.*

35f *Odors have been reported to be unbearable and have worsened at her residence.*

35g *A GCCS has been previously addressed. The EPA regulations do not require it at this stage of landfill emissions. Refer to 22c and 30a response.*

35h *A claim that the landfill has diminished the quality of life and it is getting worse was expressed. The proximity of the residence to the landfill is a factor as well.*

35i *That which is required is the Title V permit, its existing requirements and future requirements as the landfill approaches the threshold emissions to require a GCCS.*

<p>36. Robbie White 6653 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>Decaturville TN 38329</p> <p>731-614-5198</p> <p>36. The following letter was dated April 22, 2010 and received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>To Whom This May Concern:</p> <p>I moved to this area 6 years ago when I met my wife. 36a I have always been an outdoors person, enjoying grilling, four wheeler riding, sports and just being outside in general. I hardly noticed the landfill when I first moved here and being a mile away didn't think about it being there. Over the last 4 years or more it has become very obvious that they are operating a landfill next door. I never grill out and try not to be outside on the bad days. 36b Headaches and burning aching eyes are a normal when the landfill is at its best. 36c The smell is embarrassing and intolerable to the point that we do not have friends over for outdoor activities as we did before. 36d There has got to be some kind of safety measures taken at the landfill to protect the citizens of this community from the gasses they are emitting. 36e I am respectfully asking you to not grant them a permit until such safety measures are taken to protect us.</p> <p>Thank You,</p> <p>Robbie White 6653 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p> <p>731-733-6090</p>	<p>36a Mr. White's concern of interference of landfill gas emissions with outdoor activities both residential and in the vicinity of the landfill is considered to be an quality of life concern and air quality concern.</p> <p>36b Health issues from burning eyes and headaches from the landfill fumes also aggravate Mr. White similar to what some other residents reported.</p> <p>36c The odors have affected residential and outdoor activities and social events. This concern is considered to be both an odor issue and quality of life concern.</p> <p>36d Safety measures to protect citizens from the gases is considered an air quality and quality of life concern.</p> <p>36e Opposition to issuing a Title V permit is duly noted.</p>
<p>37. Jean Cordle 6653 Three Way Road Decaturville, TN 38329</p>	<p>37. The following letter was dated April 22, 2010 and received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>To Whom This May Concern:</p> <p>I have lived-in this community all my life and was here for many years before the landfill came to our area. 37a Over the last several years the smell has become unbearable. 37b I enjoy gardening in the summer and many times you cannot stand to be outside in</p>	<p>37a The intensity of odors were reported to be intolerable and have worsened over the years.</p> <p>37b Outdoor activities such as gardening have been affected by the odors. This is considered to be both an odor issue and</p>

<p>38. Pam McGaha 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38329</p>	<p>the flower beds and garden because the smell 37c will make you sick feeling. 37d Sometimes there is like a haze over the property here and on those days your eyes will burn from being outside for very long. 37e I am asking your board to give us some relief and have them install some gas systems there so that we can resume a normal life.</p> <p>Jean Cordle 6653Three Way Road Decaturville, TN38329</p> <p>731-549-3686</p> <p>38. The following letter was dated Earth Day, 2010 and received by APC on April 23, 2010</p> <p>Earth Day, 2010</p> <p>Mr. Stephens,</p> <p>38a I would like to take this last opportunity to implore TDEC to deny the Title V Permit Application for the Decatur County Landfill, operated by North Carolina-based Waste Services of Decatur.</p> <p>38b <i>This company has been operating in a largely un/self-supervised manner for over a decade.</i></p> <p>38c Information that they have submitted to your office has been inconsistent with other data provided by companies from which they take in waste. 38d <i>The company has changed hands six times in the last dozen years. Their operation is nebulous,</i> 38e and people of this county fear for the very air we breathe. I am, sadly, certain that time will prove our fears are well-founded.</p> <p>I realize that you deal with larger sites every day. That is not my concern. My only concern is the Decatur County, TN, Solid Waste Landfill.</p> <p>38f Please deny this permit.</p>	<p>quality of life concern.</p> <p>37c Odors have caused health issues such as burning eyes and were alleged to have caused Ms. Cordle to feel sick.</p> <p>37d The haze may be similar to the mist or fog reported by others and fog mist with its associated gas/odor were alleged to cause burning eyes.</p> <p>37e Refer to previous response to GCCS stating the GCCS is not yet required since the EPA threshold of emissions has not yet been reached.</p> <p>38a Ms. McGaha reiterated her concern for TN APC to not approve the Title V permit.</p> <p>38b. <i>Ms. McGaha questions the management and operation of the landfill personnel and the waste management firm, and if they are pursuing responsible oversight.</i></p> <p>38c The data provided by companies shipping and delivering their waste to the landfill was questioned with regard to what the landfill submitted to (Title V application) APC is an indirect Title V question. It should be noted that waste delivered and amounts delivered are not always tied to the landfill air emissions. Some buried wastes do not release emissions at all or may release very small amounts of emissions depending on several factors such as the components of the waste, volatility, type of waste, phase of waste such as solid or liquids etc.</p>
--	---	---

<p>39. John Topper 8663 Three Way Road, Bath Springs, Tennessee 38329</p>	<p>Thank you for your time and attention, Pam McGaha</p> <p>39. The following letter (not dated) and enclosed TRI report of Tennessee Aluminum Processors Inc was received on April 23, 2010. The letter and report were also emailed on 4/21/10.</p> <p>Subject: written comment concerning the Title V permit for Decatur County, TN Landfill.</p> <p>39a I am sending this report to contest the emission statement presented in the Title V permit request. The report is self explanatory. Items shipped to the Decatur County, TN. landfill are listed, as are the years in which they were shipped. My initial concern was focused on the shipment of lead. This report states that tons of lead and lead byproduct were shipped to the Decatur County landfill for years before and during the period of the request but zero amount is expressed within the emission report from the landfill. Did it just disappear, or did the testing at the landfill somehow miss the massive tonnage of lead and lead byproducts that are there?</p> <p>39b Another question deals with the flare system that was presented by the landfill for odor control: It was explained that a shaft or tube is placed within the cell to allow the gas byproduct to escape the entombed and sealed cells and be burned. I remember my chemistry class back in college. We never burned anything without protection. This voluntary system is venting unknown quantities of unknown gases into the environment. The system, as expressed proudly by the landfill, has a ten foot flame form at one vent and little or no ignition at the other two vents. I'm not the scientist or chemist who thought that burning the gas off causes the odor or toxic to leave the earth, because they do not. Certain chemicals/elements burn at a certain temperatures and the molecular structure or bonds are</p>	<p>38d <i>She is concerned about several turnovers or legal entity transfers of the landfill management firms contracted to operate and manage the landfill.</i></p> <p>38e The quality of the air being breathed is deemed an air quality concern.</p> <p>38f Same response as 38a</p> <p>Mr. Topper's concerns involve lead buried and lead emitted and the 3 odor flares and efficacy of combustion and associated off gases. Mr. Topper has taken extensive time and effort to express his concerns in a technical manner far more involved than most other commenters.</p> <p>39a Although material may be buried in a landfill; it does not necessarily result in emissions especially if the material is not volatile. Lead, unlike the gaseous emissions, would not volatilize and be emitted from the landfill. Any lead particulate matter would be covered and not exposed to the air. The EPA Tier 2 landfill testing detects gaseous emissions from the landfill surface and would not measure lead and lead would not have been emitted.</p> <p>39b This entire comment essentially deals with flares and questions the efficacy of flares in burning off landfill gas. The three passive odor flares burn off the gas from openings in vent pipes and a leachate cleanout pipe opening. According to the Division of Solid Waste, landfill gas consists of the approximate constituents: 45-58% methane, 32-45% CO₂, nitrogen 0-3%, hydrogen less than 1%, carbon monoxide - trace, hydrogen sulfide - 10-200 PPM, moisture up to 14%, and volatile organic compounds - 0.25% to 0.50%. Flaring reduces landfill gas pressure and combustion renders such compounds less harmful, reduces any explosion potential, and helps in odor control. Combustion efficiency is subject to the 3 T's of combustion – time (residence time of burning), temperature,</p>
---	--	--

	<p>broken and some elements are combined with others under temperature and after being heated.</p> <p>So what the landfill is doing is polluting the air quality by venting the gases, heating the gases, and basically changing the gaseous formulation into an unknown byproduct and heating the gases, forcing them to travel in an upward manner. Some gases will not burn at the temperature that ignites methane and they pass through the flame without change or filtration. What do you get when you burn or heat landfill is contamination of the air? Super heating of these gases is necessary, and then filtration is necessary to accomplish any real removal of the chemicals within the landfill.</p> <p>Getting back to the flares that burn, now and then. These are but open passageway for unknown gases that do not burn and are not ignited to enter the environment. The fact that they do not ignite does not make them less toxic and when they do ignite in combination with the methane a chemical change can take place and create new gases.</p> <p>We stopped open burning of landfills, yet we now open burn the gases through a tube at some random temperature set by whatever gas is ignited by the sparker used within the system. This uncontrolled release of gas from the landfill is expressed in the chart offered by Waste Industries Inc. The chart shows that the concentration or pressure within the landfill is less than a larger unit somewhere else on earth. The reason is that this landfill is vented into the atmosphere through the voluntary flare system setup by the operators of the landfill. They have intentionally breached the seal of the cell structure with a tube and put a sparker at the end, in the hope of stopping the smell and their intended release of the landfill gases to lower the pressure within the cells.</p> <p>39c I urge you to deny this permit.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. John Topper</p>	<p>and turbulence (amount of contact of the gases with the flame).</p> <p>The three voluntary odor flares (often used at many landfills) help reduce any gaseous odors but all odors will not be eliminated from decaying garbage and other substances. Daily ground minimization of the working face, rain covers, litter control from trucks, and other measures all help keep the odors down but cannot completely eliminate all the landfill odors.</p> <p>Flares are a recognized and common practice for landfill gas control and other operations. Efficient combustion can result in 98%+ destruction of the gaseous compounds, rendering many gaseous compounds much less harmful. EPA recognizes maximum achievable control technology (MACT) for landfill gaseous control which includes a landfill gas collection (capture) and control with flare combustion. A GCCS network connecting cell areas with an enclosed centralized flare (actively lit with an on-going flame vs. a passively lit flare combusting with sufficient gas concentration and a pilot light solar spark) will result in a far more efficient program of landfill gas destruction and odor control than the smaller flares. As has been pointed out, the GCCS sophisticated and comprehensive system is not required at this stage of emissions per Tier 2 testing. Once landfill gas reaches the EPA threshold of emissions, this will be required to be put into place.</p> <p>39c Mr. Topper reiterated his opposition to the Title V permit and has been duly noted.</p>
--	--	--

Summary of e-mail correspondence received and TN APC response after Public Hearing during the Extension Period April 21- April 23, 2010

The following email was received and constitutes **Attachment 9**.

<p>40. John Topper 8663 Three Way Road Bath Springs, TN 38329</p>	<p>40. The e-mail from Mr. Topper dated 4/21/10 was sent to perm it writer Jim Attar.</p> <p>The email contained the same language as Mr. Topper's letter that was received by TN APC on 4/23/10. However, the last 3 sentences of the email had these additional statements.</p> <p>40a <i>So, we once burned our trash in open pits. Then we decided that out of sight was better in the open.</i> 40b <i>So we now burn off the gases</i> 40c <i>and cart off the leachate to the treatment plant and dump it back into the river.</i> 40d <i>What next will the wonders of science bring us.</i></p>	<p>40a <i>The environmental impacts from previous days of trash burning at open dumps was not acceptable as pointed out by Quincy Styke.</i> See Item 20.</p> <p>40b <i>As previously discussed, flaring off landfill gas consisting primarily of methane is a typical landfill practice, widely accepted. This measure is recognized for many reasons such as reducing the explosive potential of methane gas while destroying gaseous components of landfill gas and making them less harmful, and helping reduce odors.</i></p> <p>40c <i>Pump and haul of leachate is an acceptable recognized waste management practice and water pollution control measure as previously discussed.</i></p> <p>40d <i>The future science of environmental landfill management is evolving. Mr. Topper's suggestion and concern for alternatives to burning and burial of trash is a valid concern. Alternatives are being considered and also used today by landfill owners, waste management firms and other entities. Such measures include, but are not limited to, recycling (already done to some extent to reduce trash to the landfill at certain locations that have community recycling), waste reduction, composting such as windrow composting, aerobic decomposition in open vessels, enclosed aerobic chambers, and mechanical anaerobic digesters. New technologies being considered, tested, and utilized include anaerobic digesters and plasma arc gasification to thermally produce synthetic (syn) gas from solid waste feedstock. Some landfills especially</i></p>
---	--	---

		<p><i>closed ones reclaim materials via landfill mining recovering metals such as aluminum and ferrous material, wood, and gypsum. All of these measures are a formidable topic by itself, involve economic feasibility, practicality, reliability, and the pros and cons have to be carefully considered for existing as well as new solid waste handling of wastes.</i></p> <p><i>In the meantime, organic matter already at landfills will continue to be decomposing and generate gases that must be taken care of using current technology and governed according to EPA's current regulations.</i></p>
--	--	--

Comments by EPA Region IV after 45 day review on May 30, 2014

<p>41. EPA Region IV Eva Land Air Permits Section</p>	<p>41. An email from Ms Eva Land was received by TN APC on May 30, 2014 completing the 45-day EPA review period time frame. This entailed EPA's review of the proposed final permit and TN APC's Comments and Response Summary. The email follows:</p> <p>"The EPA has completed a targeted review of the Decatur County Municipal Waste Landfill Title V permit, #558760, and does not have any comments at this point.</p> <p>Thank you for sending us this permit, and we appreciate your detailed and extensive response to comments. The response to comments document was very well organized; however, I was unsure if TDEC has a specific response to the health concerns mentioned in comments 24, 33f, 35d, 37c and d, and comment category 6. Although TDEC's concern was very clear, a comment stating that these issues are not related to the permitting action might clarify the title V permit's role."</p>	<p>TN APC acknowledges that at least 5 individuals who are nearby residents reported by oral and/or written testimony adverse health effects at times alleged to originate from the landfill. Based on their testimony, most of the health effects were associated with odors, although fumes/mist/haze/fog were also reported as contributors and sometimes contained the reported odors and fumes. Some reported these incidents did not occur all the time but on occasions and some stated the odors and fumes have increased over the years.</p> <p>TN APC recognizes that some individuals are more sensitive and less tolerant of certain odor/smells/fumes and those individuals will obviously be more adversely affected. Medical advice and necessary measures need to be considered by those individuals to protect their health and minimize the exposure they may receive.</p> <p>Since odors are inherent to landfills, odors are expected from landfills with and without a gas collection and control system (GCCS). Although a GCCS such as a typical centralized landfill gas collection and flare system can make an appreciable difference in controlling fumes and odors, odors and fumes cannot always be completely eliminated at landfills. Fugitive landfill gas can come from openings in the landfill surface including structural features such as pipework or other openings. As has been mentioned, odors and fumes can be caused by several factors. These include, but are not limited to, weather conditions (prevailing winds, inversions, humidity, time of day etc.), if the landfill surface is being worked, litter, type of waste being processed, bodies of water such as leachate ponds, and the natural decomposition of the waste itself, among others.</p>
---	---	---

		<p>The Division of Air Pollution Control and state of TN have no odor laws or regulations per se. However, for air permitted sources when air pollution complaints are reported to TN APC or to the environmental field office, the facility is investigated. For any air sources or air pollution equipment serving the operations, the facility must be in compliance with permit conditions or specific emission source requirements, especially those sources that may be related to complaints. In this situation there are no specific air pollution control regulatory requirements that require operational controls for this landfill at this time, and accordingly, there are no specific air pollution control permit requirements that must be met. For air emissions sources that can be verified by an APC inspector, the compliance status and adherence to the permit requirements are checked. Accordingly, the Title V permit for this landfill does not lend itself to adherence to permit conditions requiring odor control or checking for same. No GCCS exists or is required at this time at the landfill due to the extent of annual NMOC emissions being lower than the threshold (50 Mg/yr) at which a GCCS is required. When and if such threshold is reached and the resulting regulatory requirements are placed in a permit at a later stage of the landfill, the status of the source will be verified as to the compliance based on specific equipment, operation, and associated permit conditions when a complaint is registered with the Jackson EFO or the Division of Air Pollution Control.</p> <p>The management of the local landfill office has stated that they will receive and respond to any complaints regarding same and investigate what practices or operations or conditions were present and relevant during the period of the odor or fumes or episode that was reported to occur. The complainant needs to identify and describe as best as possible the nature of the complaint, the precise time that the event occurs, the duration, what they are experiencing and any other associated information that could be relevant. The landfill office will then in good faith consider what may have contributed (if any) to the reported episode and determine if any measures can be taken to rectify or minimize the effect of such occurrences.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>In reviewing the Title V permit federal requirements of 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW, there are no specific revisions or conditions that need to be addressed and included in the Title V permit based on the above concern. Periodic testing of the landfill emissions and annual reporting of emissions based on the most current landfill gas concentration test data and the amount of waste accepted is stipulated in the permit. The three passive voluntary flares will continue to be utilized to help mitigate odors. Good faith solid waste practices and landfill operation as mentioned in Response 21g such as adequate daily ground cover, litter management, minimizing the working face of the landfill, compacting the waste when burying it, installation of a geosynthetic rain cover (already in place), and other practices appear to be best measures at this time to help minimize odors and fumes, although they can never be completely eliminated at all times as previously discussed and noted.</p>
--	--	---

Summary of air-related comments in order of prevalence of the category and TN APC summary response

Comment Category 1: The most prevalent comment was **a request for a public hearing** for the Title V permit.

APC Response: A public hearing was granted for all those who requested it in writing during the original 30-day public comment period. These persons properly exercised their privilege as stipulated in the public notice by putting their request for a public hearing in writing and sending the request to TN APC within the allowed 30-day public comment period. The public hearing also allowed any person to submit new or additional written comments by the date of the hearing and speak for the record (oral testimony) as to their comments and concerns at the hearing. Those requesting a public hearing in writing included 93 individuals who mailed the Division of Air Pollution Control a “clip-out form requesting a public hearing” that had been published in a local Decatur County newspaper, 16 who sent letters, and those who emailed requests. All written requests were sent to the Division within the 30-day public comment period of Jan 20, 2010 through Feb 19, 2010) for the first public notice that appeared on January 20, 2010. Due to the written requests for a public hearing, a second public notice was published on March 10, 2010 announcing the date, time and location of a public hearing to be held. The public hearing was held on April 20, 2010 at Riverside High School in Decaturville, TN at 7 PM. This was done in accordance with Title V regulations allowing at least 30 days advance written notice of a public hearing pursuant to 1200-03-09-.02(11) (f)(8)i(IV) of TAPCR.

Comment Category 2: The second most prevalent comment category was regarding **issuing a Title V permit for this landfill and the Title V process** with 36 or more comments received or provided. The **subcategories** included **opposition or support for a Title V permit being issued**, comments in **general about Title V permit processing** including the contents of the submitted **Title V application**, requirements promulgated by EPA/NSPS for landfills, and the landfill air **emissions determination, and protocol methods for calculating landfill emissions (Tier 1) and test method (Tier 2)** that EPA has prescribed for landfills. A discussion of these sub-categories follows:

a. Twelve explicit comments were provided in which it was stated that they were either in **opposition of (11) or in support of (1) TN APC issuing a Title V permit**. Six of the 12 comments were written and were from 6 letters opposing a Title V permit and were received during the first comment period (January 20 - Feb 19, 2010). Four (4) letters were received also opposing a Title V permit during the extended written comment period (April 21 - 23, 2010). At the public hearing one citizen stated opposition while another stated support for issuing a Title V permit.

APC response: Regarding opposition to the Title V air permit, EPA regulations require the regulatory authority that is TN APC, to process a Title V permit for a landfill when both the design size volume and amount (mass) of waste a landfill can store reach the dual threshold levels for volume and mass. Although there was public opposition and also support regarding issuing a Title V permit, federal requirements require TN APC to process a Title V application s for a MSW landfill that meets the Title V size criteria. In other words for all sources subject to federal regulations, a Title V permit must be permitted by the authorized permitting agency, thus TN APC of TDEC. Having a Title V permit in place is necessary to implement the federal air landfill regulations which include both existing and future requirements. This regulatory obligation is reiterated in Response 1a and follows:

The TN **Division** of Air Pollution Control (TN APC) must process a Title V permit (EPA major source operating permit) for a municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill that has **both** a design capacity volume of 2.5 million cubic meters **and** a mass design capacity for 2.5 million mega grams (Mg or 10⁶ grams) of waste (equivalent to 2.756 million tons of waste). EPA regulatory rules are as follows. The above threshold for applicability, that is, mass of waste combined with the landfill storage volume make a MSW landfill subject to specific stipulations in the federal New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW - Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills promulgated on March 12, 1996. Once **both** these EPA threshold values have been reached, then a Title V permit application must be submitted and a Title V permit is required (60.752) (b) laying out the requirements a MSW landfill must meet.

b. There were at least 11 **general type of comments about Title V permit processing for a MSW landfill** from the public, APC, and landfill representatives.

Comments from concerned citizens included the following: what permit the landfill was under, a Title V permit is nothing more than a permit to pollute, what is the reason for the Title V permit, and the hearing is about a Title V permit and not about who owned or managed the landfill in the past. Two citizens commented on delays. One wrote that nothing had been done since the 1980s and alleged the landfill may have not met air regulations since that time. Another commenter asked why was there a delay in the Title V procedure from 2005 (date of application), 2008 landfill emission testing, and finally Title V processing in 2010.

Representatives from the landfill parent waste management firm and their consultant had air related comments. Matt Lamb, a technical consultant on behalf of the landfill stated the landfill emissions are primarily carbon dioxide and methane. David Pepper of Waste Industries, parent waste management firm of Waste Services of Decatur, LLC stated that Title V permit would involve closer air monitoring, does not specify what types of waste are sent to the landfill (a MSW landfill is classified for handling the type of waste it receives), and does not state where the waste comes from.

Three APC staff members addressed Title V matters during the hearing. Quincy Styke, the coordinator and moderator at the public hearing, announced the agenda, allowed the meeting to proceed with order and called upon all those who wished to speak. He gave a brief statement about the two public notices that had transpired, one for written comments and one for a public hearing. He also addressed the concerns of a commenter bothered by the format and allowed protocol of the hearing and what was allowed to be said and presented during the hearing. This occurred near the end of the hearing and it was explained why the prescribed format for the hearing was necessary, that APC had some constraints that had to be followed for hearings and had to follow a certain procedure for air pollution and Title V public hearings. Each person had an opportunity to speak for the record and comments were primarily air related but solid waste, landfill management, and water pollution issues were also stated, as well as any other concern. Eric Flowers addressed the Title V process, applicability for MSW landfills for Title V permitting procedure, and the role of public participation during the Title V review. Jim Attar, TN APC permit writer, went over the specific NSPS requirements and the draft Title V permit conditions for this facility.

APC response: The permits the landfill that have been issued were TN Division of Solid Waste Management (DWSM) permits. The reasons for the Title V permit were identified herein by APC staff members. Pertinent comments on how the Title V applies to the landfill were also addressed by the landfill management firm (contractor) and contractor staff that must implement the Title V requirements as they apply to Decatur County Landfill. The Title V permit will require on-going estimation of annual and the need for a GCCS when the landfill emissions have been established per NSPS/EPA standards to reach a certain level. The alleged delay is explained in detail about when the Title V program began to be implemented by TN APC. The concern about delay in processing Title V from 2005 was also explained and when the dual threshold (mass and volume) actually occurred that invoked a Title V submittal when Cell 3D was installed and authorized to operate pursuant to a letter from DWSM in July 2009. Also, an APC permit writer originally assigned to landfill permit processing and to this permit left the Division during this time period.

c. There were at least 5 types of concerns/questions/comments totaling 7 comments about the information in the **Title V application**. Three individuals alleged the landfill emissions would be allowed to increase by such a permit with two stating a doubling of emissions would result and another said simply there would be an increase in emissions. The amount of daily waste received was questioned since a design rate of 600 tons per day was listed in the Title V application (Page 1) versus a value of 300 tons/day. One commenter asked why there were no reported lead emissions when lead is buried there. The terminology for units in the EPA Rule 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW was confusing such as to the term megagram. Why is the permit being issued to Decatur County?

APC response: The difference in the emission values (doubling) are due to actual amount of waste received vs. a projected or maximum design value for the amount of waste and the most accurate value for NMOC concentration (thus emissions) due to gaseous testing (2008). In 2009 and subsequent years the daily amount of waste that actually was received in practice was less than 300 tons/day. Due to the varied comments and detail need to address these and the other concerns, a response to each of these matters is specifically contained in the previous body of the comments and associated APC response. Refer to 11b response.

d. There were 6 comments about **Tier 1 procedure and Tier 2 testing** that came from one commenter, Mr. John Topper. Tier 1 is EPA's calculation procedure for an initial estimate of annual landfill emissions and Tier 2 is an optional surface test of the landfill gaseous emission (NMOC) concentration providing more precise data for landfill emissions. Jim Attar mentioned the context of Tier 1 calculation and Tier 2 testing in going over the draft Title V permit. Matt Lamb discussed the EPA approved Tier 2 procedure and pointed out the NMOC concentration value multiplied by the annual amount of waste along with other variables is used to calculate annual landfill emissions in NMOC in Mg/yr. Mr. Topper had questions and concerns about the Tier 1 and Tier 2 test procedures that EPA has prescribed for landfill gaseous emissions. These involved testing during one of the driest times of the year, in December 2008, skepticism of self-testing, testing the unlined pits and if the test core procedure (Tier 2) is the best technology to determine emissions.

APC response: All of these testing matters are addressed herein in more detail. Refer to the response in Item 10 for a detailed answer. TN APC recognizes and adheres to the official EPA test procedures in the specific EPA air rules for landfills until other methods are superseded or alternate methods have been approved and allowed by EPA. The Division must use the EPA procedures in implementing the EPA rules and is not authorized to utilize alternate methods unless this is specifically approved by EPA in writing.

Comment Category 3: The third most prevalent comment category was concerning **odors**. Eight persons expressed strong concerns about objectionable odors either in writing or presenting oral testimony at the hearing and lived in the vicinity of the landfill. There were at least 19 comments and statements explaining the extent and degree of odors and how they were adversely affected by the odors. They experienced either physical concerns including health effects, psychologically, and expounded on how it impaired their

quality of life. Kim Frederick, landfill manager in 2010 stated what landfill practices were used to help reduce odors such as dozer compaction, 6 inches of daily earth cover, and litter pickup and other practices. Matt Lamb stated there was volunteer installation in 2006 use of flares to help deal with odor from the capped portions of the landfill and they also relieve gas pressure which is vented at surface and then burned by the flares. Terms used to describe odors were objectionable, horrendous, unbearable, not an everyday thing, and getting worse. There was a plea for odor control with a GCCS as a good faith effort if the landfill cared about the community. Several stated in written comments how the odor level presence has transpired over recent years. There were statements to the effect such as the odor has been worse in the last 4 years, the odor is getting more frequent and odors have been worse over 4 years over the time the person has lived near the landfill, smells have gone from occasionally to unbearable over a 5 year period, and my biggest complaint is that many days it has been consistently worse over the last 2 years. Regarding local residential indoor or outdoor activities, it was stated that odors had become embarrassing and intolerable so that friends could not be invited to their residence or for outdoor activities and smells becoming unbearable to prevent outdoor activities such as summer gardening, etc. Regarding when odors occur, one stated that in winter the smell is pulled in, it smells from early morning hours but it gets better during the day, and fogs bring in bad smells. Measures taken by residents to deal with odors on their property have included the need to use air freshening in the residence when odors get bad, hiring out outside lawn work, keeping the windows closed up in homes and vehicles and coping by other measures. Associated health effects were also alleged to be associated with odors. This is discussed separately in more detail in the health effects category.

APC response: All landfills will have odors including but not limited to several factors such as prevailing winds, humidity, moisture, temperature, type of waste, time of year, time of day and so on. The residences within the vicinity of the landfill are those most likely to be affected. While waste is being buried and exposed to the air, odors can occur and during the daily working of the landfill surface as waste is compacted, deposited, and then covered at the end of the day. The natural decomposition of garbage and other trash generate odors. This is characteristic of all landfills. The 3 odor flares voluntarily installed in 2006 help to some extent with landfill gases coming from structural vent pipe openings that surface at landfill. It is acknowledged a landfill wide GCCS with a flare or other gas collection system and control system would help destroy odiferous compounds and destroy hydrocarbons at 98% or better. This would help with odor but the landfill NMOC has well below 50 Mg/yr and is not required at this time to install such a system. Current landfill practices in place at WSD include covering of trucks with incoming waste loads, use of 3 odor flares previously mentioned (one in the leachate cleanout piping and 2 handling passive vent gas), minimizing the operating face (active landfill area being worked with waste being buried and covered daily), and adequate ground cover over buried waste (6 inch ground cover daily at end of the operating day). On January 2013 a geosynthetic rain cover was placed over Cells 3A, 3B/C, and 3D to mitigate liquid infiltration and leachate. This can decrease landfill gas generation to the air. Landfill personnel have requested anyone to report time, duration of odor and/or odor/fog to the landfill office so they can investigate the possible conditions at the time of the concern. Tennessee has no odor laws.

Comment Category 4: The next most prevalent comment was a request to install a **gas collection and control system (GCCS)** for the landfill gas. There were at least 17 comments made regarding a GCCS. Reasons given were to help control odors, public safety, At least 6 persons requested such a system, and some stating TN APC should require a GCCS.

APC Response: Per 60.752(b) when the non-methane organic compound emissions (NMOC) emissions reach 50 megagrams (Mg)/yr or 55.11 tons/yr, the owner operator shall install a gas collection and control system (GCCS) and typically a gas collection system with an associated flare system. The December 2008 NMOC test data (Tier 2 test of gaseous emissions from landfill surface points) indicated 13.8 Mg/yr of NMOC from the landfill which is far less (28%) than the 50 Mg/yr NMOC emission threshold requiring a gas collection system. Based on this testing data, it is likely that several years will pass before the NMOC emission threshold is reached requiring a landfill gas collection and flare system for methane. An increase to this level is directly proportional to the amount of waste received and a higher concentration of NMOC measured by Tier 2 testing.

TDEC/APC must implement the regulations and respective control it is authorized to follow and has in place. The EPA rule for NSPS 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW serves as the regulatory requirement that TDEC must follow. The federal requirements are included in the Title V permit. TN APC does not plan to go beyond the EPA requirements for MSW Landfills. Additionally, there is no regulatory authority to exceed the EPA requirements. If this was done it would not be consistent with the way other landfills in the state are regulated and have been permitted by TN APC with regard to NSPS and Title V air requirements for landfills. Any installation of a GCCS would only be done on a voluntary basis or if the 50 Mg/yr NMOC emission threshold is reached. In the meantime, three nuisance odor flares have been installed voluntarily.

Comment Category 5: The next most prevalent comment was regarding the **effect of landfill air emissions on the quality of life and the quality of the air they breathe**. There were at least 9 persons expressing concerns of adverse effects on the quality of life and there were 14 comments with complaints or concerns. The comments indicated their lives were adversely affected primarily from the landfill air emissions and fumes and associated odors. The comments primarily expressed interference in enjoying or preventing certain outdoor activities, breathing and smelling the fumes, and the effect of landfill emissions and associated odors entering the inside and outside of their residences and vehicles. The types of comments were as follows: We cannot enjoy the fresh country air, we need to stay indoors, destroys the beauty of our county, we have the right to clean air, we are getting our dose of what has been there

for 20 years, it prevents me from opening my windows, grilling out, don't turn up the home heating system to bring in heat or A/C to cool off house to avoid inside fumes from the landfill, the landfill should install what is needed to allow the community to enjoy our homes and outdoor activities, the air quality has diminished over the last 5 years, try not to be out on bad days, can't garden or be in the flower beds because of the smell, and fear for the air we breathe. Some of the same comments were expressed by some of the nearby residents.

APC Response: TN APC acknowledges the concerns. The odorous fumes at times appear to be a predominant factor that affects the community regarding air issues. The interference with associated outside family activities affecting their family and quality of life at their homes and property were a concern to those in the vicinity. Sensitive individuals were especially affected. The 3 passive odor flares and solid waste practices to keep odor down will help to some degree but cannot guarantee there will be no exposure to others in the surrounding landfill area. The air will not be fresh at times and the local climate, weather conditions, time of day, prevailing winds, moisture, and other factors all contribute to the impact of the landfill air in the vicinity of the landfill. Landfill personnel have expressed that they will work in a responsible and conscientious manner and will respond to complaints.

Comment Category 6: The next most prevalent comment was about adverse **health effects**. There were at least 5 persons who commented that they had experienced adverse health effects from the landfill air emissions/fumes and associated odors. The health effects included headaches (4 persons), health effects that were very hard on persons in family who have respiratory problems, eyes watering/burning/or aching (5 persons), aggravation resulting in or causing migraine headaches and side effects from migraines (1 person) such as getting sick at their stomach, light sensitivity, and smells causing the person to be queasy or feeling sick.

APC Response: APC acknowledges the health effects. Many seem to be odor related or irritation from landfill gas. Some individuals were more sensitive to landfill fumes and odors and had more adverse health effects.

Comment Category 7: The next most prevalent comment was about **flares**. Most flare comments pertained to the 3 voluntarily installed nuisance odor flares with two of the three having enough landfill gas to combust the gases. Flare comments were also made comparing what was in place to those of a typical landfill flare serving a GCCS system collecting landfill gas which was burned off by a large central flare for the entire landfill. Five persons had comments about flares, two believed they were very much needed with a GCCS and one questioned the efficacy of combustion (partial or poor combustion) of the landfill gases by using a flare. Two other commenters were from two technical personnel on behalf of Waste Services. The company representatives explained there was insufficient landfill gas for combustion gas although three odor nuisance flares were installed at the landfill. Their comments were primarily associated with a flare from a large gas collection and control system (GCCS) that are required to be installed by larger landfills because the pre-control NMOC emissions were more than 50 Mg/yr of NMOC. Mr. John Topper had extensive comments and concerns about how effective the passive flares were and if useful in destroying the gases, if the flare was merely changing the chemical composition of some of the chemicals, if flares only partially heated the gases and then became buoyant gases transported to the environment, and were a vent to relieve gaseous cell pressure and exposed the cell gases to the atmosphere. He also was concerned there would be no gas filtration of combustion particles.

APC Response: The voluntary odor flares also used at many landfills help reduce gaseous odors but all odors will not be eliminated from decaying garbage or trash. The spark igniters kept lit by solar cells is a good practice to help sustain combustion by keeping the flares burning. It is agreed that the three small odor flares would not have as high combustion and destruction efficiency as a large central flare serving a GCCS which has a higher VOC concentration (more fuel) from all the landfill gases sent to a large flare. Flares are a recognized control method and are considered MACT (maximum achievable control technology) and are the most common practice for landfill emissions control. Efficient combustion can result in 98% plus destruction of the gaseous compounds. However, until the landfill meets the NSPS mass and volume criteria in the future, such a system will not be in required to be installed at this time due to federal NSPS regulations. Daily ground cover and other landfill practices will continue to be used to reduce the odors. If the emission level reaches the 50 Mg/yr of NMOC threshold, a GCCS which is typically controlled by a centralized flare will make a large difference. Pursuant to 1200- 03- 04-.04(1)(g) of TAPCR, "smokeless flares or safety flares for the combustion of waste gases" are exempt thus exempting the 3 odor flares from Title V permitting.

Comment Category 8: The next most prevalent comment was about **hazardous and/or toxic emissions**. Four persons made statements about these matters. The statements included a commenter saying that hazardous materials were dumped into the air and two said they would be living with toxins. Ms. McGaha was more explicit and detailed her concern stating that besides methane and other gases, solvent-based compounds including toluene and benzene and other volatile organic compounds of concern and toxins are released. She also mentioned concern about metal emissions including aluminum and lead. Although aluminum was mentioned it is not in itself a toxic material.

APC Response: Ms. McGaha is correct in stating that hazardous/toxic compounds do exist at a landfill but these represent a small portion of the landfill emissions. Although other gaseous emissions exist, non-hazardous methane is the most common emission. The primary emissions from landfill gas are from methane from the decaying waste (accelerated by heat and moisture) and carbon dioxide, each roughly comprising about 50% of the total landfill gaseous volume. Non methane organic compounds (NMOC) constitute a small amount of the landfill gas (less than 1% by volume) with some hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and toxic compounds. The

AWMA reference book Air Pollution Engineering section entitled MSW Landfill Gas Emissions listed at least 34 toxic/HAP compounds emissions. Other gases that may be released include hydrogen sulfide, nitrogen, hydrogen chloride, and various VOCs and solvents. These gases represent a small portion of the total landfill emissions. Although the odor flares will destroy and render some of these compounds less harmful, a GCCS with a large flare would be much more effective in destroying some of these compounds and rendering them less harmful and diluting the remaining concentration of these gases. The gaseous compounds from the Decatur County Landfill are typically in such small concentrations, that they would not pose a health threat.

Metals such as aluminum (non-HAP and not an air toxic) lead (HAP and toxic) are not likely to be emitted as compared to gaseous compounds since they are buried particulate (solid matter). However, aluminum dross interacting with moisture can release various other gaseous compounds of concern including ammonia. The landfill quit receiving the aluminum dross several years ago.

Comment Category 9: The next most prevalent comment was about a fog or foggy mist. Four individuals mentioned fog/foggy mist/haze alleging they came from the landfill or from the vicinity of the landfill. Three of the four persons claimed that associated objectionable or strong smells or odors accompanied the fog or mist they experienced and one person referred to a haze that burned the eyes. They did not state what time of year this occurred or time of day when it occurred. The 4 specific comments follow.

1. "and the thick fog that comes when the smell is so bad"
2. "In the 4 years that I have lived here the smell has gotten more frequent and stronger and you can actually see a fog at times"
3. "My biggest complaint is that many days that has been consistently getting worse over the last 2 years you can walk outside and actually see a foggy mist over the fields here and the smell is unbearable"
4. "Sometimes there is like a haze over the property here and on those days your eyes will burn from being outside for very long"

APC response: The Decatur County MSW landfill has several bodies of water include 2 sediments ponds, a leachate pond, and two storm water ponds. These bodies of water or nearby bodies of water can provide the moisture to generate fog if conditions are right. However, fog can form locally without the bodies of water at a landfill for other reasons. Moist wet areas of land can also generate the moisture to form fog, such as wet fields, marshy areas, nearby creeks etc. Regardless of the source of moisture during fog formation gaseous air mass coming in contact with the fog can carry the odors. Unfortunately, odorous gaseous compounds can be transported within the fog and then can be detected by smell.

Technical literature lists the following regarding fog.

Fog can occur for a variety of reasons when conditions are conducive to its formation. The persons mentioning fog experiences and associated odors are consistent with what other persons have reported about fog near landfills.

Fog consists of condensed water particles and moisture can condense on particles from a land fill or could carry the odors gases when they pass over the fog. Fog and odors have been reported near landfills. The Mass Department of Environmental Protection (Mass DEP) states the following:

"Meteorology can vary from location to location and greatly affect where and at what concentrations contaminants are present in ambient air. Mass DEP has noted a strong correlation between certain types of atmospheric conditions and odor complaints at many landfills. Odor complaints tend to coincide with little or no wind, fog or high humidity, overcast skies, and during thermal inversions. These meteorological conditions tend to occur early in the morning or evening. These types of weather conditions typically occur during the change in season from Fall to Winter and from Winter to Spring. Odor complaints are rarely received during clear, sunny, and windy days."

The reasons for fog formation and the frequency of fog at this landfill are beyond the scope of this summary.

Summary of comments not related to air pollution in order of prevalence of the category and TN APC response

Several comments were made that were not related to air pollution matters. They are listed below but will not be addressed by TN APC unless noted since these matters are not related to the purpose and context of the air pollution matters, Title V air permit conditions, and are beyond the authority of the Division of Air Pollution Control. Some of these matters may or may not have relevancy in the Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste and the Division of Water Resources, or other TDEC entities. Some comments are in general and are outside that of TDEC jurisdiction. Although these issues can be considered on a case-by-case basis as separate matters, they would not fall under the authority of TN APC. They are categorized below in the order of the number of persons commenting either in writing and/or by oral testimony at the public hearing. These are mentioned to make commenters aware that these issues were acknowledged by TN APC and what relevancy they may or may not have toward air matters.

Comment Category 1: The most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **trucks and traffic entering or leaving the landfill.**

Seven persons had comments about landfill truck issues. Five (5) people were concerned about traffic matters, one justifying the extent truck traffic, and one person neutral requesting more information on county statistics of truck traffic. The 5 concerned persons were all residents within a few miles of the landfill. Three of these 5 were concerned about the amount of truck traffic to and from the landfill with two mentioning a traffic increase expected and one of the residents was concerned about the current noise from the trucks at an intersection near their residence. One person was especially concerned about a safety issue with trucks running stop signs and being run off the road and numerous incidents of their own mailboxes being damaged and then having to be replaced. One person contested the accuracy of the statement of 25 trucks per day as a statistic and stated a lot more than that occurs. A landfill official of the parent landfill management company stated that an average of 25 trucks per day in 2009 moved in and out of the landfill with less than 1% of the Highway 69 traffic count.

Comment Category 2: The second most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **litter or trash falling onto the roads and yards of nearby residents.**

Five persons commented about litter. Three persons had concerns and comments about litter, one resident stated trash ends in their yard, another stated trash is scattered along the road and is sometimes picked up, another stated bags and paper ought to be covered and/or tied down and acknowledged that some trucks are not owned by the landfill. Landfill manager Kim Frederick explained their the landfill litter program regarding adequate (6 inch) ground cover, compacting loose garbage, use of closed trucks to control litter, and a daily pick-up and sweep system. Mr. David Pepper also mentioned landfill personnel pick up litter in and around the landfill. After follow-up on this concern, it has been reported by WI that approximately one third of the trucks are owned by WSD and the other two thirds are third party haulers. The trucks are required to be covered. Litter pickup is routine at the landfill. As part of a good-faith effort, there is some pickup of litter on local roads as needed.

Comment Category 3: The third most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **changes or transfers in the landfill management companies** that were contracted to operate Decatur MSW Landfill.

Four persons commented about the changes or new waste management firms that were contracted with Decatur County to operate the landfill. One person stated it was quite confusing and difficult to follow the mergers, acquisitions and legal name changes and which company (parent or subsidiary) was actually in charge of the landfill and who legally owned the Decatur County Landfill. One person questioned why 6 landfill management firms have been involved and that this is nebulous (vague) as to who is in control. David Pepper explained in detail the chronology of waste management firms from the beginning, some of which involved mergers and thus name changes. One person, an employee of the landfill, stated the firm management name changes are irrelevant to the Title V permit being reviewed, implying that substantive matters are only relevant to Title V.

Comment Category 4: The fourth most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **groundwater (GW) concerns and GW monitoring.**

One person mentioned insufficient GW monitoring in a letter. Another person at the public hearing believed based on oral testimony of landfill officials that GW and drinking water were sufficiently protected. The landfill manager stated the GW is monitored, a GW well exists, GW is regularly tested, and there are no problems. Mr. Lamb stated the landfill gas is outside of the GW and migration in the soil and GW is checked. Mr. Pepper stated the liner system protects both GW and surface water.

Comment Category 5: The fifth most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to concerns about **landfill management such as the level of trust, motive, and communication.**

Three persons commented about these issues. One person stated that a few local businessman interests do not protect the aesthetics of Decatur County. One person alleged the landfill management was unsupervised, nebulous, and the corporations were more interested

in a profit rather than community interests. One mentioned the county officials did not communicate well about what goes on at the landfill including truck traffic in and out of the landfill. There were no counter comments or rebuttals to the above comments.

Comment Category 6: The sixth most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related **to the origin and distance of waste being shipped to the landfill and the area of service for waste pickup and delivery to the landfill.**

Three commenters discussed this matter. One person questioned the contract and area of receipt of waste and accepting waste outside of a 75 mile area if 600 tons per day were not received. One person was concerned about waste coming from waste transfer stations and taking waste from New York City. Mr. Pepper stated that Waste Industries, the parent company of WSD, has transfer stations and waste is received from a 75 mile radius that includes northern Alabama and Mississippi.

Comment Category 7: The seventh most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **concerns about leachate collection, handling and recovery.**

Three commenters discussed this matter. One person stated in a letter there was no leachate recovery system. Kim Frederick stated that there was a leachate collection system, a recovery pond, leachate tank, and truck haul off to Jackson. Leachate is tested monthly. Mr. Pepper stated the leachate treatment system utilized does not use recirculating leachate since the facility is too small for such saturation.

Comment Category 8: The eighth most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to **concerns about the landfill liners and the fate of the landfill.**

Three commenters discussed this matter. One person was concerned about a liner holding up for 30 or 50 years, if clay liner would be reliable for that period of time and was concerned about the unlined portion of the landfill. Matt Lamb mentioned the liner protects the gas and GW. David Pepper talked about how the liner protects the contamination of GW and surface water.

Comment Category 9: The ninth most prevalent comment based on the number of commenters was related to concerns about **the type of waste received at the landfill.**

Two commenters mentioned this matter. One person wrote of concerns about air permitting of a “hazardous special waste landfill”. The DSWM permit accommodates special waste allowed if specified. Such special waste is not necessarily hazardous waste. Per DSWM a Class I disposal facility is one that takes non-hazardous municipal solid wastes such as household wastes, approved special wastes, and commercial wastes. Regarding special waste approval, persons who wish to dispose of special waste in a permitted landfill or have the special waste processed in a permitted processing facility require special waste approval from the Tennessee Division of Solid Waste Management (DSWM). Examples of special wastes are sludges, metal finishing particles, incinerator ash, process filters, medical wastes, sandblast grind media and paint chips. Treatment storage and disposal (TSD) sites handle hazardous waste such as such as RCRA hazardous waste but this landfill is not one of those. Per the landfill manager, 99% of the landfill waste is household and commercial waste. Another commenter was concerned about aluminum waste dross at the landfill. A TRI landfill report indicated the landfill quit receiving aluminum material in 2005.

Final Conclusions regarding the Title V permit

TN APC has responded in detail to all of the comments both written and oral that are air and non-air related. TN APC has used its regulatory authority to implement any federal and state regulations that are applicable to this landfill and other similar landfills in TN within this category. Accordingly, the federal requirements of New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) 40 CFR 60 Subpart WWW - Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills that are specifically applicable to the landfill TN APC have been included in the permit issued by TN APC. EPA's comment after their 45-day review regarding the residents' reported health effects was duly noted and addressed. The Division found no appropriate requirement from either state or federal rules to specifically address the alleged health effects/concerns that were reported and then include such requirements in the Title V permit. These were addressed and duly noted in detail in the comment summary and associated responses. Other solid waste landfill management practices that would not be included in a Title V air permit appear to best address this issue until a GCCS if required is invoked. Accordingly, the issued Title V permit was not revised to include this matter. The issued Title V permit contains all pertinent state and federal air pollution requirements that are applicable at this time.

If the landfill non-methane organic compound emissions (NMOC) emissions reach the 50 Mg/year threshold as determined by applicable federal procedures in Subpart WWW (calculations and testing), the requirements for a gas collection and control system (GCCS) will become applicable and the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) requirements of 40 CFR 63 Subpart AAAA – National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills will also become applicable, and the permit will be modified as required. The initial draft permit referred to the asbestos condition D9. The final issued permit contains the specific applicable portions of the federal rule entitled 40 CFR 61 Subpart M – National Emission Standard for Asbestos. The applicable state rule counterparts contained in TAPCR 1200-03-11-.02 are included as well. These were included to clarify specific applicable asbestos regulations of Subpart M that pertain to active waste disposal sites (landfills that receive asbestos containing waste) since this landfill as well as other TN landfills are approved to receive asbestos. This facility is approved to receive non-friable asbestos. The asbestos disposal procedures have already been in place but this is now included in the permit to reiterate the requirements. It is noted that the landfill is not a major source of HAPs (area source) and is not a major source of greenhouse gases (GHG) with less than 100,000 tons per year of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions.